DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 450 815 JC 010 115

AUTHOR	Fisher, James L.
TITLE	College of DuPage Review, December 1999-February 2000.
INSTITUTION	College of DuPage, Glen Ellyn, IL.
PUB DATE	2000-02-22
NOTE	91p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Planning; Educational Assessment; Educational Change; *Institutional Characteristics; *Institutional Evaluation; Self Evaluation (Groups); Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*College of DuPage IL

ABSTRACT

This report analyzes the institutional characteristics of the College of DuPage (Illinois). Through a series of interviews and a review of materials in 1999-2000, a team of six objective experts identified issues affecting the college and helped establish an agenda. Based on the findings, the team recommended that the college: (1) pare its core course offerings and spend more time evaluating and assessing its courses; (2) discuss distance education and prepare for any negative effects; (3) offer more opportunities for faculty to expand technology in the classroom; (4) examine where and how it is using part-time faculty; (5) assess all faculty salaries and consider increasing them; (6) implement an aggressive and comprehensive diversity plan, making efforts to increase the diversity of faculty and staff; (7) examine its need for administrators and consider eliminating unnecessary positions; (8) perform an administrative reorganization as soon as possible; (9) expedite its decision-making process, especially on important issues; (10) implement a single primary governance body under the president, which would include representatives from all constituent groups, faculty, students and classified staff, and would make recommendations to the president; and (11) change its calendar to three 16-week terms. Thirty-seven recommendations are detailed in this report. Appendices include biographies on members of the review team, a list of interviewees, the interview form, and an index of materials used in the review. (EMH)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 450 815

CONFIDENTIAL

COLLEGE OF DUPAGE

REVIEW

DECEMBER 1999 - February 2000

James L. Fisher LTD

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED B

Vincent Pelletier

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Donald Cahill, Vice President for Institutional Advancement, Marian College
Judith Eaton, President, Council for Higher Education Accreditation
James V. Koch, President, Old Dominion University
Irving P. McPhail, Chancellor, Community College of Baltimore County
Beverly Richardson, Provost, Mercer County Community College
James L. Fisher,Chair, Review Team
February 22, 2000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

Introduction ..... Chapter I, p.1

Overview ..... Chapter II, p.3

Academic Programs ..... Chapter III, p.11

Technology ..... Chapter IV, p.13

Faculty ..... Chapter V, p.19

Students ..... Chapter VI, p.27

Administration ..... Chapter VII, p.30

Budget and Finance ..... Chapter VIII, p.38

Institutional Advancement & Government Relations ..... Chapter IX, p.42

Intercollegiate Athletics ..... Chapter X, p.46

Governance ..... Chapter XI, p.49

Recommendations ..... Chapter XII, p.58

Members of the Review Team ..... Appendix A, p.69

Interviewees ..... Appendix B, p.75

Interview Form ..... Appendix C, p.85

Index of Materials Used in the Review ..... Appendix D, p.88

Fisher Template ..... Appendix E, p.89

I. INTRODUCTION

During February 2000, a team of six persons, each widely experienced in higher education and none having any present association with the College of DuPage (COD), reviewed the general condition of the College (Appendix A). The Review was authorized by the Board of Trustees, chaired by Ms. Mary Kranz. The Review included processing materials and conducting interviews from December 8, 1999 through February 22, 2000.

The purpose of the Review was to assist the Board of Trustees and the President in assessing the general condition of the College. It was felt that a completely objective assessment would candidly identify and address any issues affecting the College of DuPage and help to establish a tentative agenda for the immediate future.

In addition, the Review might offer these benefits:

(1) The Board of Trustees and the President would have a more accurate impression of the College of DuPage and consider more specific and realistic plans and expectations.

(2) Others with whom the Review might be shared would consider the report to be a legitimate and less biased opinion of the College of DuPage which might differ from their own.

(3) The region, the state and beyond would have a heightened awareness of, and interest in, the College of DuPage because of the involvement in the Review and a public report on the results.

The Review considered the following in terms of strengths, limitations, and/or aspirations:

- General condition of the College of DuPage
- Academic programs
- Faculty
- Students

- Administration
- Technology
- Senior officers
- Budget and finance
- Fund-raising
- Public relations including alumni and legislative relations
- Governance
- Review of the calendar issues
- Comparative condition
- Other issues and conditions presented during the course of this Review.

Before beginning interviews, the members of the team held discussions with members of the Board and staff. Team members also read and evaluated materials assembled by DuPage staff and a position paper prepared by the President. All counted, interview and focus groups included 343 persons including faculty, students, staff, alumni, elected/appointed officials, area residents, local business persons, Board members, media representatives, benefactors, and potential benefactors, persons selected because of special knowledge and randomly selected persons from the community (Appendix B). Interviews were based on position, stratified random sample, and random sample. All interviews followed a general format that included 15 separate areas (Appendix C). Interviewers were to ask about, but not press, each of the areas and all interviewed were advised that their opinions might be used in the final report but *without* attribution.

Readers should bear in mind that although much of the Review can be documented, much of it is based on the opinions of those persons interviewed. Wherever the opinions of the Review team are expressed, it shall be obvious.

This Review is the exclusive work of James L. Fisher LTD and should not be attributed to individual members of the Review team.

II. OVERVIEW

Clearly this Review confirms that the College of DuPage is one of the premier community colleges in the United States. Located primarily on 273 attractive and well-maintained acres in Chicago west suburban Glen Ellyn, it constitutes a model for other community colleges in Illinois and across the nation. It offers a comprehensive set of credit and noncredit programs and an unusually generous range of courses. Further, it enjoys a superb reputation within its service area for providing strong academic programs and student sensitive services. Local employers and public officials applaud the College's connections to the region and are particularly pleased with the workforce development programs and activities that the institution provides. These range from information technology training programs such as Microsoft certification to highly praised training of policemen and firemen. Tens of thousands of area citizens attend more than 400 cultural events annually at the institution's wonderful McInnch Arts Center and its NPR-affiliated radio station is a magnet for jazz aficionados. The College's library, which relies substantially upon technology and in some ways serves as the public library for the region, recently was named the outstanding community college library in the nation.

With 34,000 students registered for both credit and noncredit programs, the College of DuPage easily is the largest single campus community college in Illinois and it operates more than 70 sites within its District 502 service area. The student body is increasingly diverse in an ethnic sense and 22 percent of students are classified as members of a minority group, up from 14 percent in 1990. 10.2 percent of the College's students are Asians or Asian-Americans and 7.9 percent are Hispanic. Yet, an impressive variety of individuals from other ethnic backgrounds attend the College. African-American students account for 3.2 percent of the student population and a veritable United Nations of students has chosen to attend COD as well. It is worthy of note that the third most commonly spoken language in District 502, after English and Spanish, is Urdu.

But, the diversity of the College's student body can be measured in other ways. The mean age of its students is 33 and 29 percent of its students are 40 years or older, even though the modal (most frequently observed) age is only 19. Twenty-three percent already have earned a degree, and no fewer than 200 already possess an earned doctorate. These students are attending COD for reasons that range from upgrading and modernizing their computer skills to polishing their ability to do proficient ceramic work. Fifty-eight percent of the institution's students are women. Nearly all are employed even though many are retired in a technical sense. For most, the College is an attractive portal to a new or better job, an easily accessible source of cultural enrichment, or a first step toward an associate's degree that will enable them to transfer to a baccalaureate program at a university. However, only about one-third of the College's students indicate that they intend to transfer to a four-year institution after they finish their work at the institution.

Why do so many students choose the College of DuPage? First, there is little question that it offers a strong and highly attractive set of academic programs that often lead to immediate employment. The College is accredited by the North Central Association and holds a host of specialized accreditations besides. Second, the College offers targeted workforce training that has simultaneously drawn many students plus kudos from the employers who wish to hire these students. Third, the COD home campus is large, better maintained than nearly any campus we have seen, easily accessible, well lighted, safe, and boasts adequate free parking. Third, the College is highly sensitive to student needs and offers popular GED, ESL, and adult education programs to thousands of students. Fourth, the College has taken pains to offer an attractive mix of credit and noncredit courses at times and places that are attractive to a highly mobile citizenry that is increasingly mobile, short of time, and interested in results. Fifth, the College allows students to select a variety of learning modes (supervised and independent study, experiential learning, and distance learning in addition to conventional classrooms) that many individuals find attractive. Sixth, until recently, the College has not faced substantial competition within its major service area from a permanently situated public university.

Seventh, the College's $32 per quarter hour tuition and fee charge is hard to beat and, as one more mature student who has taken courses at the College for more than a decade put it, *"at this price, COD is a tremendous bargain."* Eighth, the College has a splendid record for its students obtaining meaningful employment when they complete their course sequence, obtain a certificate, or graduate.

One secret of the success of the College of DuPage is the support that it receives from the citizens, firms, and governmental units within its huge 900,000 citizen District 502 service area. The College relies extensively on consumer and citizen surveys to ascertain what services its customers desire and its President has become well known for visiting corporate and governmental units in an effort to match the College's offerings more precisely to these organizations' needs. The support the College receives is reflected in the praise of Silicon Prairie enterprises such as Lucent, but also in the appreciative comments of a host of small firms and local governments units who find the institution an excellent place to send employees to upgrade their skills. All of this generates citizen support and is among the reasons why, at approximately $5,100 of funding revenue per FTE student, the College is one of the better supported community colleges in the country.

As we begin the 21st century, it is a bit unusual to find an institution of higher education that is characterized by generally dedicated faculty and staff, high levels of student satisfaction and, in addition, strong community support. All exist at the College and are validated by our interviews and survey data. President Michael T. Murphy is generally well liked (*"He stops to say hello, and he never forgets names,"* observed a classified staff member), is admired for his concern for individual students (*"I have attended two other colleges and this is the first place where it is obvious that the President has his priorities right,"* commented a part-time student), and his efforts to develop a collegial atmosphere at the institution. Most believe that he is open to discussion and persuasion, and has attempted to give every constituency within the College an opportunity to offer its opinions. According to a veteran faculty member, *"We appreciate his spirit of inclusion."*

However, on campus there is also another perception of the President's leadership style. One senior faculty member summed it this way, "*We have gone from decisiveness to indecisiveness. If the President doesn't do something quickly, his collegial notions will do him in!*" Other concerns were raised about the President's leadership style which will be discussed in Chapter XI. However, there may be mitigating circumstances for this condition which will be discussed later in this report.

It must be noted that during the President's tenure, the College has engaged in considerable innovation (for example, its foray into distance learning), placed strong emphasis upon workforce development and training (an illustration is its Cisco certification training), opened a set of new service sites throughout its service area, constructed new buildings, and yet maintained a strong record of fiscal rectitude. **Further, our conversations with other community college presidents and political figures throughout the State reveal that the President is highly regarded by them and that he is considered to be a leader by his peers. *"President Murphy stands out because of his success and because he is an articulate exponent of his views,"* according to a national community college leader. Another national leader said, "*We wish he were more active at the national level.*" Further, throughout the external community in the region and in Springfield, the President is enjoyed and admired.**

The major challenges the College faces today are four fold. First, the environment in which it operates is mutating almost hourly. A host of new collegiate competitors has chosen to locate within its service area. These institutions range from the ubiquitous University of Phoenix to Northern Illinois University. Other institutions such as Illinois Benedictine College have begun to offer associate's degrees in direct competition with COD. Still other competition has arisen from a dozen or more major corporate universities and learning programs. Less measurable, but clearly important, are the distance learning initiatives of institutions from around the United States and around the world. Many of these institutions are profit oriented and they are extremely responsive to student needs, offering modularized courses, strong technological support, and attractive locations and schedules.

The import of this new higher education environment for the College must not be ignored. The College must continue to change, to be flexible and adaptable, and to pay attention to its diverse constituencies. Only by so doing will it prosper. This will require intelligent planning and, we emphasize, prompt and timely action. *"Community colleges that don't pay attention to these trends are going to get run over like a pedestrian in front of a bus,"* asserts the president of a large community system in another state. For College of DuPage, then, the future is now and only at its own peril will it rest on its laurels. The College's enrollment peaked almost a decade ago and it must audit its environment thoroughly and move ahead expeditiously.

Second, the 1991 cap on the assessed values of property adopted by the Illinois General Assembly already has put a serious dent in the College's revenue. Since the cap took effect, the College has not received an estimated $10 million in tax revenue that otherwise would have come to it. This problem will surge to the front burner within the next few years as the empty land within the College's District 502 becomes completely built up with houses and firms. At that point---absent tax increases---the College's property tax-based revenues, which comprise 55 percent of its revenues, will not increase significantly. This will place the institution in a very different fiscal circumstance, though one that can be anticipated. **Ergo, either the College must learn to live and operate on less, or it must begin a campaign to convince the electorate that a tax rate increase is merited. Probably both strategies must be pursued. This will require wise leadership and the willingness to change long accustomed ways of operation.**

Third, the College must find ways to pose substantive issues and reach decisions concerning important issues much more promptly than it has in the past. Many of the College's constituents laud and appreciate the participative, collaborative style that the President has introduced to the campus. Frequently, however, this style has not generated timely decisions, and sometimes no decision at all. A faculty leader who is a strong supporter of President Murphy nonetheless complained, *"We are always appointing task forces, or new committees to study something, or we are always trying to get every last person's agreement to something. The result is a kind of paralysis. Nothing gets done."* A classified

staff member acidly commented that *"If we wait any longer for reorganization, we will all have taken early retirement."* A supportive, but disappointed faculty member commented that *"Increasingly, this President surrounds himself with administrative personnel who talk the same language. They are always in favor of more participation and discussion and they talk about 'community' and 'valuing people over machines.' At first, this talk was charming and rather comfortable, but it has grown old and now most of us simply want some firm decisions, even if we don't like them."*

We believe that the College should continue to seek widespread participation, but at the same time invoke clear deadlines for commentary and ensure that decisions are neither delayed nor avoided. No institution of higher education of which we are aware has succeeded for long periods of time on the basis of rule by committee. Campus consensus is laudable and a generally desirable outcome. Nonetheless, an unremitting search for consensus often tends to eliminate bold actions, diminishes or eliminates intelligent risk-taking, and often results in what one higher education authority has labeled "*lowest common denominator solutions*." The 21st century is unlikely to reward institutions that are laggard and extremely risk averse. This style is wearing thin.

Fourth, the College's Board of Trustees has become, as a public official put it, *"an embarrassment."* Board meetings often are featured by public bickering between Board members, *"ad hominem rants by individual Board members,"* adversarial letters and motions, inappropriate interference into the daily operational affairs of the campus, surprise introduction of topics for action by some Board members, and single issue politics that ignore the fundamental, long-term needs of the institution. Several Board members, despite having received votes from only about two percent of the citizens of District 502, regard themselves as having what one asserted to be *"a mandate to get involved in the College's affairs."* With this in mind, it was reported by many that they have become intimately involved in the daily operational affairs of the College and in numerous instances have gone well beyond any reasonable definition of the policy-making role they should occupy. This "*embarrassment*" was mentioned often both on- and off-campus.

Several Board members apparently believe that it is appropriate for them to go around the President of the College and "*check up on him*" by conducting personal investigations of different aspects of the College's daily operations and by taking informal polls and votes of confidence on the President and his administration. Let there be no doubt, as we shall present later in this Review, there are appropriate times and places for substantive reviews of presidents and institutions; however, weekly, nonobjective forays by some Board members such as have occurred at the College of DuPage are not among them. It was reported that several Board members invite members of the College community to bypass the President and to come to them directly with complaints, information, and even innuendo. In so doing, they seriously reduce the President's credibility on campus and damage his effectiveness. It is extremely difficult for any college president to be held responsible and accountable for the welfare and operations of a college if that president must contend with faculty, staff, and students who routinely ignore him/her and take even pedestrian business directly to members of president's board of control. Why deal with the President and the administration when you can bypass them and go directly to the Board?

Related to this, several Board members have been publically critical of the President's decision-making, or lack thereof. This is, by itself, a mistake. The Board should always provide public support for its President. If it cannot do so, it is time to find a different President. A college president cannot be expected to be a strong and decisive leader if he/she cannot depend upon the public support of his/her board, is frequently blind sided at board meetings by the surprise introduction of issues, and is subjected to intrusive interference in the affairs of his/her institution on a daily basis. **The result of such behavior at COD has been a serious decline in respect for the Board of Trustees, both on- and off-campus**. A number of faculty and staff members believe that this institutional review is a "*witchhunt*" orchestrated by some Board members and designed to get rid of the President because of personal reasons.

Many report inertia at the College, but is the inertia the result of the President's style or the inappropriate behavior of the Board of Trustees or both? The answer appears to be both. This Review will address each issue.

For the good of the College, we believe that some members of the Board of Trustees of the College of DuPage must change the very assumptions upon which they base their Board responsibilities and further that they absolutely must change their public behavior. Yes, every college president must be held accountable and this Review is one of the means by which this accountability should be obtained. However, several members of the Board must cease and desist from their persistent interference in the internal operations of the College, focus instead on policy-making, permit the President to administer and lead the College subject to annual evaluation and accountability, and terminate the public carping and criticism that they levy against each other and against the President. The College is not likely to come to grips with the significant changes in the environment of higher education that we noted above if its Board spends its time focusing on internal squabbles, backbiting, "*one-upmanship*" of the President, and pedestrian decisions about items such as the wrestling team. There are dozens of vital issues that are more important and the citizens and the students of the College deserve better.

These challenges noted, we nonetheless place the College of DuPage among the elite institutions within the panoply of community colleges in the United States. It is a strong institution with excellent facilities, a very capable faculty and staff, sufficient resources, and impressive public support. We do not exaggerate when we state that the College is envied by most other community colleges in the country. The salient task of the College community in the few years is to maintain and build upon this excellence, recognizing as it does so that flexible, thoughtful, and prompt responses will be required by the rapidly changing nature of the societal environment in which it operates.

III. ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

The College of DuPage offers a very comprehensive set of academic programs for credit and noncredit. At the beginning of the 1999-2000 academic year, the College offered 49 occupational programs that seldom lead to transfer to a senior institution and 45 transfer-oriented programs. These programs collectively lead to five distinct and separate associate's degrees and a multitude of certificates. Only about a third of COD students appear to be interested in transferring to a senior institution via one of these programs.

In contrast to our experience on most campuses, we did not detect any academic programs at the College that we would label as "*weak and in need of significant improvement.*" Generally, the institution does at least an adequate job with all of its programs, though as we will point out below, several are too heavily dependent upon part-time and adjunct faculty. External observers have particularly complimentary things to say about COD's programs in the health sciences, management information sciences, its police and fire personnel training, and several of its conventional arts and sciences disciplines.

Earlier in the 1990s, empirical evidence suggested that the College's students often did not fare as well academically as the students from other community colleges when they transferred to Illinois public universities. More recent data no longer show this trend, which in any case might have been due to a variety of demographic, economic, and social factors quite unconnected to the quality of the College's instruction. **Even so, we urge the College to continue to monitor closely the performance of the students that it sends to senior institutions, as well as to examine in detail the performance of its students on certification examinations.**

In the area of general education requirements that must be fulfilled by those students who will earn an associate's degree, the College is gradually transiting from a cafeteria-like situation where students can choose general education courses from among a large number of different courses to a more restrictive model in which a smaller number of choices are offered. The Illinois Articulation Initiative (IAI) standards have much to do with this trend, which we applaud.

An associate's degree should reflect reasonably well defined educational goals that students have attained, for example, the ability to write cogently and coherently rather than hodgepodge of disparate possibilities.

The notion (as stated in the 1999-2001 *Catalog*) that students might usefully choose among 16 different English courses to satisfy the Humanities requirement, or among six different Psychology courses to fulfill the Social and Behavioral Sciences requirement, is not a sound one. It is nearly impossible for the College to evaluate the effectiveness of its General Education Core Curriculum if there is little common educational experience among the students who complete the Core. Ordinarily, no academic discipline should offer more than two courses within the Core. These courses ought to be rigorously defined and developed, constantly assessed, and given high priority. Such attention is much less likely if dozens of courses are involved. Ultimately, the College ought to be able to demonstrate that its students are learning, that they are attaining specific educational goals, and that specific courses either do (or do not) help the College achieve these outcomes. We recommend that the College pare its Core course offerings, spend more time evaluating and assessing its courses, and refuse to accept on faith that specific courses or course sequences actually work.

IV. TECHNOLOGY

Very few community colleges in the United States have incorporated technology into their offerings and activities as much as College of DuPage. Led by President Murphy and Vice President Wenger, the College has made major investments in instructional and administrative technology, especially microcomputers. COD supports 3,500 microcomputers at its various locations and by some counts has 80 distinct microcomputer laboratories. Students are uniformly pleased with the access they have to microcomputers (*"It's much easier for me to get onto a PC here than it was at Northern,"* observed a transfer student), and every single full-time faculty member to whom we talked had a microcomputer in their office, had Internet access, and was using e-mail.

Vice President Wenger estimates that two-thirds to three-quarters of the College's PCS have Pentium or better chips. He indicates that the non-Pentium machines all will be replaced within the next 18 months. This is both admirable and necessary and we salute the College in general for its well developed plans to replace obsolescent and outdated equipment. Many institutions of higher education ignore the aging of their equipment stock; College of DuPage recognizes what is occurring and acts accordingly.

Yet, perhaps the most impressive aspect of the College's technology environment is the strong support that it provides to faculty, staff, and students who utilize technology on the campus. Rare is the campus where constituents have told us, as they repeatedly did at COD, that *"When I have a problem, people come quickly and they know what they are doing."* A veteran staff member recalled that *"When I came to COD, I didn't know how to turn on a PC. They were very patient and taught me everything I needed to know. Now, I am considered to be the area expert!"* It is apparent that the College has made a major investment in the support personnel who install, maintain, and repair technology (especially microcomputers) and that most of these individuals are skilled teachers and trouble shooters. Like most institutions of higher education, the College struggles to attract and retain such personnel. Nevertheless, the institution deserves kudos both for the amount of technology that it has deployed on the campus and for the resources

that it has devoted to maintaining that technology.

There were some concerns, however. Some students and part-time staff reported that they did not have e-mail access and some faculty and staff felt that technology had been given too high a priority.

The College's *Information Technology Strategic Plan: Fiscal Years 2001-05,* which was only adopted recently, is an excellent document that is notable for taking a realistic view of the costs associated with technology replacement. It also provides a proposed time schedule for technology investments and replacement which, of course, is dependent upon the availability of funding. In this regard, the College ranks above many campuses, where technology investment and replacement are carried out on an *ad hoc* basis. **The College is a national leader in the attention that it devotes to technology issues. We applaud this focus and regard it as one of the College's major achievements in the decade of the 1990s.**

Distance Learning: Threat and Promise

The higher education environment in the United States is changing rapidly; some say a "*revolution*" is occurring in terms of price, quality, demographics, and access. At the very least, new technologies and changing attitudes have enabled many more American students to "*shop*" higher education to find the peculiar combination of academic program, quality, price, and availability that best suits them. There was a time when individual institutions exercised a virtual monopoly within given geographic regions or cities. That is no longer the case. Distance learning institutions such as the University of Phoenix now claim to register more than 90,000 students annually in dozens of locations around the country and via "*asynchronous*" (non-real time) Internet connections.

These developments already are having profound effects on College of DuPage. Residents of District 502 already can, if they wish, access a variety of college courses via the Internet. Perhaps 50 courses are being offered by COD itself this semester. Currently, however, nearly all

of these courses are "*asynchronous*" and "*dumb.*" That is, an individual student does not talk to a live professor in "*real time*" at the same moment. Instead, a student may access a Web-based course, see pictures, do exercises, and view tapes, all without talking "*one on one*" to a faculty member at that moment. Then (hours or even days later), the student may send a message to the Web site or to the professor. However, close on the horizon is high quality, "*real time*" instruction via the Internet. Imagine a world in which Disney, Microsoft, the SUNY System, and Dallas Community College form a consortium to deliver courses using high speed, full stream video techniques, perhaps via cable modems that deliver speeds 50 to 100 times faster than the modems that one typically finds in microcomputers today. Further, imagine that the professors who teach these courses are nationally renowned experts and that the teaching tools and techniques that are used not only are up to date, but highly attractive, and that the students may carry on a live conversation with the faculty member, perhaps using already available technology such as Gateway 2000's highly regarded Destination Computer System. Finally, imagine that the courses offered via this route are priced competitively with the College of DuPage.

If this scenario seems unrealistic, it should not, because a situation approaching this likely will be unfolding across the United States within twelve months. Internet content providers such as @Home (which has access to 60 percent of the homes in the United States because it is partially owned by cable giants TCI and Cox) already are negotiating with institutions of higher education (and others) to do exactly this. **What this means is that citizens in the Chicago area gradually will acquire the ability to do high quality, interactive higher education in their homes or places of business, and to do so at highly competitive prices. Needless to say, this will present a major challenge to the College of DuPage and everyone else in higher education.**

How should the College react to these challenges (only some of which we know about now)? There are three possibilities. First, the institution could ignore these developments, emphasize the traditional personal contact and caring attitudes of its faculty and staff, plus its small classes and strong services, and reemphasize this as its niche in this new world. Second, the College could accelerate its own efforts to originate and distribute its own distance education.

Third, the College could choose to partner with one or more large providers of distance education, probably four year institutions, and use the resources of those providers to augment its current course and degree offerings in order to attract and retain more students.

The first strategy is the most risky. College of DuPage must of course continue to provide excellent, personalized education to its students. There always will be a large segment of students, especially at the undergraduate level, who will prefer, and be willing to pay for, the experiences one ordinarily receives on a campus. Nonetheless, if even ten percent of these students opt for distance learning alternatives because of price, greater course and degree selection, or convenience, then the College has a problem. While there is no hard evidence yet available on this matter, it is reasonable to hypothesize that one reason among several why the College's enrollment seemingly has hit a plateau is that it is facing "*unseen*" competition from distance learning institutions. Hence, even it takes pains to become both distinctive and excellent in its on-campus, *"bricks and mortar"* education, College of DuPage probably must look at the other two strategies as well.

The second strategy, which involves the College in the distribution of its own distance education, is somewhat risky because of the very substantial fixed costs associated with distance learning. The financial economies of scale associated with distance learning are substantial; per student costs fall dramatically as more students and more sites come on line. Distance learning cost curves look very much like cost curves for computer software. Development costs for software are substantial; however, once one actually is in production, the more sales the better. Bigger software firms, especially those who were first in the market, retain huge advantages over smaller firms because the firms with larger sales are able to spread their fixed costs over many more units. So also it is with distance learning. Hence, if College of DuPage is to become a large, free-standing distributor of distance education, then either it must receive a substantial financial assistance from someone, or it must become very large, very fast. The truth is that distance learning usually is quite expensive, particularly when it is done on a small scale basis. Institutions that actually have performed rigorous audits of the real expense associated with distance learning usually have been surprised to find how costly it has been, and how much

faculty and staff time it has consumed. The College should cast a skeptical eye upon the claims of those who argue that distance learning courses constitute a relatively costless alternative to conventional instruction.

The third strategy, partnering with other institutions, is an approach that the College probably should undertake even if it pursues either or both of the first two strategies. An instructive example in this regard is Virginia's Old Dominion University, which this year will record approximately 17,000 student registrations with its interactive televised distance learning system known as TELETECHNET. Old Dominion uses distance learning to distribute junior, senior, and graduate course work organized into 30 degree programs and has some 70 sites in a half dozen states. The receive sites typically are located at a community college, a liberal arts college, or a military base. Many colleges like the arrangement because they have found that it draws more students to their campuses. Community colleges perceive they are better off because they utilize the system to present to their students additional majors (for example, in engineering technology) that they do not offer on their campuses. Students take the first two years of courses from the community college and then the final two years from Old Dominion, or from other a rapidly increasing stable of institutions ranging from Oklahoma State University to the University of Maine. The community college typically receives a rental payment for facilities utilized, and so the program is a profit center for the institution as well. This approach speaks to the occasionally expressed desire of some College of DuPage students to have the College offer some baccalaureate degrees.

We cannot deal with all of the challenges of distance learning here. It should be apparent, however, that students now have the ability to compare collegiate offerings (price, quality, access, service, etc.) to an extent they never had before. Some believe that this will turn the college marketplace upside down. Probably not. But, it already has made a difference and could have profound negative effects on College of DuPage if it is not prepared. Further discussion should take place and tentative decisions made and confirmed both on the campus and by the Board of Trustees. This is too important a matter for the College to approach willy nilly, allowing individual faculty and academic programs to go their own way. Financially and

programmatically, the College must do intelligent planning for its distance learning future and should avoid an *ad hoc* approach.

V. FACULTY

In fall 1999, the College employed 1,583 faculty and individuals classified as faculty such as counselors and librarians. The ratio of part-time to full-time faculty is almost 5:1, although the College reports that almost 50 percent of its sections ultimately are taught by full-time faculty. The 1999-2000 student/faculty ratio is either 19:1 according to data provided the team, or 22:1 according to data contained in its *Institutional Portrait.* The former would place in the College very desirably in the upper ranks of community college nationally, while the latter is close to the national average for community colleges. Virtually all faculty interviewed were dedicated to the College, thoughtful and articulate; yet, many were anxious about the condition of the College. This anxiety centered on the poor decision-making process and the inappropriate behavior of some members of the Board.

The COD faculty are well qualified. Almost 70 full-time faculty hold an earned doctorate and all but seven percent of full-time faculty hold at least a master's degree. Students have high praise for them as a group. Comments range from *"They really care about whether we learn,"* to *"My faculty members always have been willing to spend extra time with me,"* and *"They are better teachers than the ones I had in high school."* It is apparent that the typical COD full-time faculty member is strongly committed to the College and his/her students. Many take on extra duties, spend additional time advising students, offer their students career guidance, and spend significant time serving on campus committees in addition to explicitly academic duties. Their loyalty to the College is considerable and they exhibit an intense pride in the obvious progress the institution has made since its founding. *"Every time I come to the campus, I swell with pride because we really have created something special here,"* said one faculty member who also went on to criticize those (including some members of the Board of Trustees) whom she believes do not give their jobs their best efforts or are injuring the College's image and effectiveness.

Several interviewees cited diversity as a major problem and indicated that often minority faculty were recruited for one year appointments which were not renewed.

Part-time faculty, who are far more numerous in the College's faculty headcount, tend also to be well qualified, although there is more variability in this regard. Part-time (adjunct) faculty ranks include individuals who range from eminent scientists at the Fermi Lab to high school graduates who bring with them strong occupational experience or vocational talents. Many of these faculty members have taught at the College for years and clearly do not do so primarily for the income, which is not especially high. *"I like what I do here and frankly it is one of the highlights of my life,"* asserted an adjunct faculty member who has taught at the College for more than a decade.

When the College encounters problems with part-time and adjunct faculty (and such problems do exist, according to both students and faculty), more often than not it is because an academic program has been forced to hire faculty to fill slots in rapidly expanding programs, or because a scheduled faculty member cannot fulfill his/her duties. In such cases, lamented an associate dean, *"We often have to scrape the bottom of the barrel."* Several students reported that while they were quite satisfied with the quality of the College's faculty overall, they sometimes encountered adjunct faculty about whom *"we wonder where they found them."* Faculty comments suggest that this is a function both of a lack of diligence on the part of those who are doing the hiring, the tightness of Chicago area labor markets, and wage rates that may not be especially competitive in some disciplinary areas. We address related problems in the next section.

The Part-Time/Full-Time Challenge

Approximately 50 percent of class sections offered at College of DuPage are taught by full-time faculty. There is considerable discomfort among the full-time, permanent COD faculty about the proportion of class sections that are taught by part-time and adjunct faculty members. Many full-time faculty worry that the quality of their academic offerings could be compromised if they utilize too many part-time faculty. What constitutes "*too many*," of course, is not completely clear. However, many full-time faculty members connect this judgment to their perceptions that *"we are being overloaded with students to advise,"* that part-time faculty do not spend sufficient

time on campus or with students, that such faculty do not pull their weight serving on committees, that *"part-timers are not as motivated,"* and that on occasion they are not as well trained and prepared.

Reality is that many part-time faculty members are superbly motivated and qualified. *"I have some part-time faculty who are better qualified and more experienced than my full-time faculty,"* observed an associate dean. Part-time faculty members often bring concrete experience to the College's classrooms and, as a second year student expressed it, *"[she] is better at connecting the textbook to the real world than my other teachers."* By the same token, however, several faculty members reported that *"sometimes we have to search high and low to get part-time faculty members,"* the end result being somewhat erratic or unpredictable performance by those employed.

Not to be ignored in this equation, of course, is the financial necessity for the College to employ many part-time faculty members. The typical part-time faculty member is paid less than $2,000 per course taught. Thus, a three course load (the standard in many academic programs within the College) would cost the institution $6,000, or less, for a semester, and $12,000, or less, for a year. Contrast this to the mean annual full-time faculty salary at the College of more than $62,000. Clearly, the College could not offer its current programs with its current revenues without strong reliance upon part-time faculty members.

What is also true is that the distribution of part-time faculty is quite uneven across the College. The ESL program, for example, is heavily dominated by part-time faculty, as are the programs in English and mathematics. This is a generic issue which is worthy of additional attention on the part of the College. We believe that the current distribution of course sections between part-time and full-time faculty (about 50 percent) is appropriate. What may be less appropriate is the highly uneven distribution of part-time faculty across the institution and the amount of training and supervision part-time faculty members receive (sometimes, it is minimal). Judicious use of part-time faculty will always be an important feature of a community college, and College of DuPage is no exception. **That said, the College should examine where and**

how it is using part-time faculty, how it is compensating them, and (especially) how it is recruiting, training, supervising, and evaluating them. The key to obtaining excellent performance from part-time and adjunct faculty is to not ignore them. As much as possible, the College should treat them as it does it full-time faculty: train and orient them, support them, supervise, observe, and evaluate them, include them in departmental and area meetings, assign them mentor colleagues, and listen to them.

The Early Retirement Challenge

The community college system in the State of Illinois was established in the 1960s and the College of DuPage accepted its first students in 1967. It expanded very rapidly thereafter. Consequently, it employed many new faculty and staff in the next 15 to 20 years. Many of these new hires came to the College as comparatively young people and many individuals in this cohort are now approaching conventional retirement ages. Hence, faculty, classified staff, and administrative ranks are heavily populated with a cohort of individuals who likely will opt for retirement in the near future, not the least because the College has presented many of them with early retirement incentives.

Every academic institution needs and can benefit from a continuous stream of new personnel. Ideally, the entre of these new individuals will be evenly spaced over time so that departments, units, and academic programs do not contain individuals solely of one vintage. Unfortunately, that probably is not the situation the College faces right now. Hence, the challenge the College faces is both to space out pending retirements as much as possible and to find capable replacements. The latter task is especially crucial, but will be difficult, for many of the prospective retirees are individuals who literally have grown up with the institution and whose loyalty and commitment to COD are legendary. It is not clear that the College immediately will be able to replace such attitudes and contributions, regardless of the salaries it might offer.

We must report that there is significant apprehension on the campus that the College will choose to replace retiring full-time faculty members with additional part-time faculty members in

order to save money. *"That will kill our program,"* complained a senior faculty member, who alleged that part-time faculty members do not pull their weight advising students, serving on committees, finding jobs for students, and so forth. We do not propose a solution for any problem that might exist here. **We believe that the College's administration would be well advised to develop and publicize a plan that speaks to its intentions to replace retiring full-time faculty members. This topic is a concern with many non-retiring faculty and should not be ignored.**

Faculty Salaries

Whether or not the salaries the College pays it faculty are adequate and competitive depends upon the reference group one adopts.

- Within the Illinois Community College arena, the College's salaries are above average at most ranks, and above average overall. However, cost of living differences, especially those that relate to housing, more than account for the observed differential. Specifically, the cost of living difference between Glen Ellyn and a downstate city such as Peoria is eight percent if the individual concerned is a renter, but 38 percent if he/she will be a home owner.

- Within the Chicago metropolitan area, the College's salaries are competitive, but less so, because many competitors exist (academic and non-academic) who bid up the wages that the College must pay.

- If the reference group is all community colleges in the United States, then COD's faculty salaries are well above average. Once again, however, when cost of living differences are taken into account, a portion of the observed differential between the College and national averages is erased. It is four percent more expensive to live in Glen Ellyn than the national average if one is a renter, and 34 percent more expensive in Glen Ellyn is one is going to

be a home owner.

- If the reference group is community colleges located in large metropolitan areas with roughly similar costs of living, then the College's faculty salaries are competitive.

We conclude that the current levels of faculty salaries that the College is paying its full-time faculty are generally adequate to the task; however, in specific academic disciplines (for example, those relating to technology and some in the health sciences), problems exist. Further, we note that better than average salaries are necess ry if the College wants to maintain its status as a distinctly better than average community college. Ultimately, the College will get what it pays for in the area of faculty salaries and it should not expect to employ a substantial number of individuals with the talent and dedication of those who joined the faculty decades ago if its faculty salaries merely approach national averages.

As noted elsewhere, though some problems exist in the salaries that are paid to part-time and adjunct faculty members. The College's rate of compensation per credit hour is greater than that paid by most other community colleges in Illinois. However, these rates may be insufficient in the Chicago metropolitan area and in certain disciplines.

Finally, we believe that the College should increase the extent to which its faculty salary structure reflects merit and market principles. The College does not give all of its students a C grade in their classes, yet it tends to give most faculty members the same raise, regardless of their performance. In the words of one faculty member, who has found the College's current merit salary process complicated and bureaucratic, *"They need to make it [merit salary payments] more attractive and less complicated."*

1998-1999 Average Academic Year Faculty Salaries

Instructor	Assis Prof	Assoc Prof	Professor

College of DuPage **(1999-2000)**	$62,374 average for all ranks; the College did not supply data by individual faculty ranks			
All Illinois CCs	$53,417 average for all ranks			
Moraine Valley CC	$32,000	$40,400	$53,400	$63,500
CC of Baltimore, MD (Catonsville)	$30,700	$36,600	$47,100	$57,300
Howard Community College, MD	$35,700	$41,300	$47,600	$58,100
Jackson CC, MI	$47,200	$53,000	$58,700	$63,500
St. Louis CC, MO (Florissant Valley)	N.A.	$44,400	$53,700	$61,400
Essex County CC, NJ	$42,400	$47,300	$65,700	$73,500
Nassau CC, NY	$45,800	$55,300	$65,200	$81,200
Suffolk CC, NY (Western)	N.A.	$46,900	$53,900	$69,000
AAUP Public Two Year Colleges With Ranks	$34,316	$39,937	$46,151	$54,875
AAUP Two Year Colleges with Ranks, East North Central Region (Ill., Ind., Mich., Ohio, Wisc.)	$35,407	$40,823	$49,186	$57,354
AAUP Two Year				

Colleges with Ranks, 70th Percentile				
Nationally	$35,142	$40,522	$47,750	$57,373

VI. STUDENTS

The headcount student body at College of DuPage numbered 34,073 in Fall 1999. 29,034 of these students (85.2 percent) were taking courses for credit. The credit/noncredit ratio remained relatively stable during the 1990s. The College is easily the largest single campus community college in Illinois, though its peak enrollment (more than 35,000) occurred in 1991.

The College's student body is predominantly part-time (74 percent) and this reduces the full-time equivalent (FTE) student body to 15,665. Fully 18 percent of the College's Fall 1999 students were new to the College and were taking their first course, though 31 percent of full-time students were attending COD for the first time. Full-time students, therefore, tend to be short-term students of the College. Seventy-four percent of full-time students were freshmen. These data imply that full-time students at the College tend not to persist as often as part-time students, either because they drop out, or because they choose to transfer to another institution. Indeed, according to the College, only 27 percent of its students indicate that they plan to graduate from COD. Increasingly, College of DuPage students come to the institution, take what they need (and only sometimes is that a degree), and leave, perhaps to return a few years from now when they need more education and training.

Twenty-two and one-half percent of the College's student body already possesses an earned academic degree. An attention getting 1,839 students already hold the master's degree and 239 students already hold the doctorate. This underlines the extent to which the institution is retraining and refocusing many students who come to it, often because they need to upgrade or refine their labor market skills, or because they intend to change jobs. At the same time, the College also enrolls a prolific number of students who seek nothing more than intellectual fulfillment and enrichment from the College. Frequently, these students are much more mature than the usual student, and often they are retired from their major life's work. A 71 year young retired public school teacher represented many when she appreciatively opined that *"This College keeps me alive and alert. I take courses, do the fitness routines, and attend lots of campus events. It costs so little that I almost think I am stealing."*

The consensus among faculty members is that the College's student body is exceedingly diverse in terms of ability and preparation for College. On one hand, as just noted, almost one quarter of the student body already has earned a degree and more often than not these students are motivated, goal oriented, and high achievers. *"Most of my middle aged students are a joy to have in class,"* asserted one faculty member. Another commented that the degree-holding students are *"curve busters"* and lead their classes in terms of discussion and test performance. Less euphoric statements are made about the College's younger, 18 to 21 year old population. *"Almost one-half of all the students in my class cannot deal with even elementary abstractions and complex concepts,"* commented a faculty member who teaches developmental courses to a predominantly full-time, younger student cohort. Another faculty member commented that his classes are bimodal in terms of ability and motivation----many strong students, many weak students, and increasingly fewer students in the middle.

As noted in a previous section, the College's student body is steadily becoming more ethnically diverse. Asians and Asian-Americans (10.2 percent) account for almost one-half of the College's 22 percent non-Caucasian students. Minority enrollment has almost tripled since 1983 and has increased seven percent since 1992. These changes parallel demographic changes that are occurring in DuPage County and District 502. **The College should also endeavor to improve faculty and staff minority representation.**

As is the case with most community colleges nationally, a clear majority of the College's students is comprised of women (58 percent). More often than not, these students are more mature individuals who hold jobs, are raising or already have raised families, or are retired. In fact, more than 70 percent of COD students are 21 years or older, and 43 percent are 30 years or older. Almost seven percent are 65 years or older. Hence, age diversity exceeds ethnic diversity on the College's campus.

The most popular single declared major of College of DuPage students is Computer Information Systems, followed by Nursing, Graphic Arts, and Accounting. Engineering and science majors are not on this list and their enrollments have been disappointing, according to a

technology faculty member who told us that *"The difficulty of the course work appears to discourage many students from considering my field."*

By and large, students are satisfied with their College of DuPage experience. Both our interviews and the College's surveys indicate that the typical student believes that the quality of the faculty and the courses is good, the physical environment of the College superb, and the price is right. Representative are comments of a 25 year old women, who praised her faculty, saying that *"They seem to always be ready to meet with me when I need help and they nearly always do a good job teaching."* Some students are especially appreciative of alternative learning opportunities that the College provides such as independent and supervised study, and distance learning. Further, several students had compliments for the College's experiential learning program, though two faculty members suggested to us that the College should reexamine its practices in this regard.

VII. ADMINISTRATION

Regardless of how an administration is organized (and we will touch on this topic below), it must find the ways and means to carry out certain fundamental administrative tasks such as maintaining buildings and grounds, cleaning offices, mowing grass, admitting and registering students, dispensing financial aid, collecting and paying bills, and so forth. From all reports, the College accomplishes these tasks better than most institutions of higher education. **Representative of multiple comments are those of a faculty members who has served on the faculties of four other institutions of higher education: *"I've been other places, and I have to tell you that this campus is cleaner, better run, and better maintained than any of the other places where I have been."*** Similar comments were made by many students who have studied at other institutions. Our own observations revealed that COD works very hard at maintaining an attractive campus environment. Compared to many other campuses (some very nearby) that we have known, it is a paragon in terms of appearance. The College brags that it is in a *"zero deferred maintenance*" state. While some regard this as an exaggeration, it is very substantially true. This is an institution that repairs leaky roofs, fixes broken doors, paints on a regular schedule, and (in general) makes a very determined attempt to keep abreast of maintenance needs.

We also can report that we received relatively few complaints by faculty, staff, and students about administrative services such as admissions and registration (the latter provides students with a variety of virtual alternatives). Predictably, financial aid administration attracted some critics, but not to the extent observed on many other campuses. In any case, many of the problems that students encounter with financial aid procedures on this and other campuses are the results of federal rules and mandates.

The structure of the College's administration has been a sore point for several reasons. First, some members of the Board believe that the administration is top heavy and have pressured the President to eliminate many administrators such as associate deans. It is true that data suggest that the College appears to have more administrators than many other community colleges in Illinois, at least on a per student FTE basis. Even so, this could be a function of the way in which

positions are labeled. On most community college campuses, department chairpersons exist and such individuals are classified as faculty. At College of DuPage, however, no such positions exist. Instead, a series of associate deanships has been established that in effect rolls several department chairperson positions into one. That said, this is an area that the President should examine in detail and assemble appropriate comparative data from comparable urban/suburban community colleges nationally.

A second reason why the College's administrative structure has been a matter of interest is that President Murphy has been considering its reorganization for an extended period of time, and some administrators are uncertain about their own decision-making ability during such an ambiguous period. The President's proposed new model would be much more conventional than the current model and would involve the establishment of several vice presidencies. Given the size and complexity of the institution, we find it hard to quarrel with this approach. One way or another, such administrative posts are going to be needed, whether or not they are labeled vice presidencies. **An important message would be conveyed if at least one of those vice presidents was a highly qualified member of a minority group.**

Our major advice to the President is that he implement the administrative reorganization as soon as possible. Absent circumstances of which we are unaware, the Board and the campus should support these changes. One cannot hold a President responsible for leadership and administration if at the same time one imposes someone else's administrative organization and notions of how things should work, nor can a President hold delegates accountable without clear lines of delegated responsibility and authority. The Board should support his choices in this regard and then hold him responsible for responsible, timely, and effective administration.

Classified Staff

The classified staff echoed the strong general support and regard for the College heard from others. Two other issues emerged. There is a concern that the classified were being asked to

do more and more work, much of which is outside classified assignments and what they considered to be the work of administrators. They are particularly worried that the number of administrative retirements will have a negative impact on their workload. Second, many classified staff complained frequently about the lack of effective communication. They claim that they are not sure if and when key decisions with the College have been made and that this affects their work. For example, they, like others, claim they do not know the status of the current reorganization.

The classified staff, in addition to feeling overworked, want more documents (in abbreviated form) like the January 2000 *Institutional Review: President's Report*. Classified claim that this document is a "*first*." They indicated that if any one thing could emerge from this evaluation, it should be providing them with more and better information. They point to the institutional e-mail as a wasted resource because everything from gripes to bake sales are on e-mail, with no means to sort the important from the unimportant and nothing to guide them to information they might need, especially from senior officers.

The Academic Calendar

One of the most contentious issues on the campus of the College of DuPage is whether the College should remain on a quarter calendar or instead switch to a semester calendar. Our discussions with campus personnel reveal that a large majority would prefer to retain the quarter calendar system. Those who prefer the quarter system sometimes cite academic reasons for their choice. Some faculty and student proponents believe that the shorter quarter system permits both faculty and students to focus more intensively on a specific subject, arguably increasing learning. In this regard, many argue that older, employed, highly mobile community college students generally prefer shorter academic terms because their schedules often do not permit them to make a longer time commitment. A more mature student put it this way, "*My job means that I can't commit to 16 or 18 weeks for a course. The quarter system fits me better.*" Others believe that the delayed beginning of the fall quarter (at least compared to semesters) avoids the usual Labor Day holiday interruption that characterizes institutions on a semester system. Still others believe

that the time and resources that would be required for faculty and staff to switch departmental courses and campus administrative systems to a semester system simply is excessive relative to the benefits. And, of course, some quarter adherents simply have become comfortable with the system and are resistant to change – to semesters or anything else.

Those who advocate the semester system nearly always have in mind an "*early*" semester such that fall semester classes begin in August and end before Christmas. The second semester begins in early January and ends in early May. In fact, this calendar is now followed by more than 80 percent of all institutions of higher education. In the State of Illinois, we believe College of DuPage is the only community college to utilize a quarter calendar and nearly all four-year institutions to which COD's students transfer operate on an early semester system. This means that some of the College's students cannot transfer seamlessly. By way of illustration, at the end of COD's winter quarter, in mid-March, there are virtually no institutions to which students can transfer because nearly all four-year institutions are in the middle of their semesters. Further, since the spring quarter does not end until mid-June, by that date, many four-year institutions already have begun their summer sessions. While individual four-year institutions may differ from this pattern somewhat, the general lack of coordination between quarter and semester calendars can be quite problematic for transfer students if they come from what one pro-semester faculty member called "*an outlier institution*" that is on a quarter calendar – which, unfortunately, College of DuPage is.

Some partisans of a semester calendar believe that certain academic topics are best taught in a circumstance where students have more time to digest difficult material. For example, it is alleged by some in academe that subjects such as mathematics will overwhelm students if they confront substantial new material every day and that students need additional time to do problems and exercises, and for the material to "*percolate*." There is some empirical evidence in favor of this proposition, though somewhat the opposite inferences appear to hold for the study of foreign languages. In such disciplines, daily repetition and recitation seems to be important. Hence, it is fair to say that the evidence is mixed on this question.

Some students (and some members of the Board of Trustees) champion semesters because

they note that it is likely that students will spend less money on textbooks in a semester system (two semester purchases per academic year rather than three quarter purchases). While there is evidence in favor of this proposition at other institutions, the precise savings clearly depend upon faculty book ordering habits.

All things taken into account, we believe that the College of DuPage would be best served by moving to an "*early*" semester system (one that does not divide the fall semester over a Christmas break). The "*outlier*" argument we sketched above is not by itself persuasive, but it is important. To be sure, the College is now out of step with most of the remainder of higher education, and the decades long trend toward early semester calendars shows no sign of abating. Perhaps more important, we believe on balance that because a semester system is longer, it is more conducive than the quarter system to innovative modular scheduling models that we will discuss below. **In truth, scheduling is far more innovative than simply moving to semesters and must be considered by the College. Neither the semester system nor the quarter system is especially well suited to the schedules of increasingly mobile students who have many other life commitments. A more lengthy semester system, however, typically provides more innovative scheduling opportunities than a quarter system.**

That said, we must also note that the College should not underestimate the time and resources that will be required to make such a calendar change. Surprisingly large amounts of faculty and staff time will be required to convert courses to a semester system and other campuses' experiences clearly tell us that pitched arguments will ensue about how many semester hours previous quarter courses should be, how many courses should be required, and so forth. For example, by usual standards, a typical five quarter-hour course translates to a three and two-thirds semester hour course. If this is rounded up to a four-hour course rather than the usual three- hour course that characterizes most semester institutions, then the College will have to revise and reduce the number of courses in most of its degree programs, including general education. Nonetheless, despite the battles that often result, many of these calendar-generated discussions are worthwhile because they require faculty to reexamine their courses, justify their offerings, and retool their curricula. Nonetheless, one should not expect faculty members to undertake these

activities happily, and the extensive faculty time involved and the possibility of related compensation sometimes have become a collective bargaining issue on other campuses.

Over the long term, however, the most important academic calendar changes that the College should contemplate relate primarily to modular and short course possibilities. Today's highly mobile students may be transferred to another city, or may be given an intensive short term work assignment by their employer, or may have variable family responsibilities, and hence often prefer modular courses that are shorter than either a semester or a quarter. For example, consider a three-week course in which students go to class fifteen hours per week (at variable times during the day and perhaps on weekends). Or, consider a four-week course in which students attend class for 11 hours per week; or, a five-week course in which students attend class nine hours per week; or, a six-week course in which students attend class seven and one-half hours per week. Alternatively, consider "*weekend only*" courses in which students attend class on every other weekend (eight weekends) for five and one-half hours each time. It should be possible for College of DuPage students to complete some degree programs entirely on weekends. There are many other possibilities to consider. We emphasize that such innovations should be introduced in addition to regular semester courses.

The College already utilizes some of these scheduling routines; it should consider many more. Institutions such as National University in California have made fame and fortune by molding their academic schedules to the needs of mobile, time pressed individuals for whom conventional semester and quarter schedules are not ideal. **We strongly recommend that the College undertake sophisticated surveys of its current student body, of area employers, and of potential pockets of students who might be found at libraries, churches, governmental units, schools, immigrant and ethnic centers, and so forth. The surveys should ascertain what course schedules would best suit the students' needs and how courses might be sequenced to fit the time preferences and career needs of COD's students.**

All too often, institutions of higher education schedule their courses and programs when faculty and staff want them to be taught rather than when students want them to be taught. Higher

education is one of the few industries that attempts to behave in this fashion. We believe that one way the College can effectively combat the increased competition it is facing in its service area is by disposing of the notion that either semesters or quarters necessarily fit the needs of most students. With the possible exception of Harvard and a few other institutions in the educational firmament, most conventional institutions in the higher education marketplace of the 21st century must become much more student and consumer sensitive if they hope to prosper. The College has the opportunity to lead the way in this regard in a strong, vibrant student market with great potential. If it chooses to do so, then it will carve out a profitable and productive niche. The result will be higher enrollments, increased student satisfaction, and greater public support. If it does not choose to do so, slowly, over a period of time, it will find its market share eroding and profit-oriented institutions pushing it out of the way.

Campus Security and the Guns Issue

During the past year, campus security personnel, backed by a variety of other individuals, have requested the right to carry guns while on duty. This request has divided the campus. We have two observations to make. **First, we believe that it was and is inappropriate for campus security personnel to bypass the President and the administration to publicize and promote their position Further, we believe that it is unacceptable for campus security personnel to attempt to organize opposition to a president on this issue, or to attempt to influence a board on this issue**. This is particularly true if security officers were aware of such conditions before accepting employment. They must deal with their supervisors and with the President. Of all areas of an organization, security officers should exercise constraint and discipline.

However, although this decision should be the President's, in general, we believe that it is appropriate for thoroughly trained campus security personnel to carry arms. American campuses and metropolitan areas today are unpredictably dangerous and security officers must be prepared. However, by thoroughly trained, we mean – at a minimum – that any officer must have successfully completed the equivalent of a state police academy in order to be eligible to carry a gun. Even then, depending upon the officer's assignments, carrying a gun might well not be necessary. Thus, not all officers necessarily should be authorized or

permitted to carry a gun. And, in order to continue to carry a gun, an officer must complete periodic retraining, weapons and firing range training, and the like. Carrying a gun, then, must be a revocable privilege rather than a right of every security officer. In the end with such a policy both the College and its people will be better protected.

VIII. BUDGET AND FINANCE

Compared to many community colleges nationally, the College of DuPage is reasonably funded. The College receives approximately $5,100 in revenue per FTE student from a combination of support from the State of Illinois, District 502, and tuition and fees. The national average is almost 20 percent less than this, although many of the community colleges in other states are located in rural areas and hence deal with a much lower cost of living. The College's funding per FTE is not at all unusual for an urban/suburban community college that must pay higher prices for many goods and services, especially personnel. The cost of living in DuPage County is about 4 to 8 percent higher than the national average if the resident is a renter and 32 to 38 percent higher if the resident is a home owner.

In particular, the College faces labor markets that require higher salaries than are paid at most community colleges, including most of those in the remainder of the State of Illinois. Since 76 to 78 percent of the College's budget is spent on personnel, this is a serious consideration. Further, tight labor markets for skilled personnel in the Chicago region have tended to bid up the salaries that COD must pay to attract and retain personnel, especially in technology intensive occupations.

Nonetheless, the most serious financial challenges for the College in the future relate to the changing (and perhaps stagnant) sources of its $86+ million annual operating revenue. Consider each of the three major sources of the College's revenue:

Property Tax Based Contributions from District 502: Currently, these constitute 55 percent of the College's revenues. However, as noted in a section above, within a few years, the 1991 assessed valuation cap on property will begin to have serious effects on this revenue source. Already, during the 1990s, the cumulative effect of the freeze on assessed values of property has been more than $10 million. When the land area of District 502 has been completely utilized by new construction, then the revenue that the College receives from this source will be frozen unless citizens approve a tax rate increase.

Given current political trends, this would be difficult to achieve. Hence, the institution must begin to plan how it will live in a world in which its revenues (at least from this source) are stagnant. If, after thorough consultation, the conclusion is that a tax rate increase is called for, then the College must recruit prominent public citizens, business firms, and political leaders to sell this need to the voting public.

State of Illinois Tax Support

When the Illinois Community College System was established in the mid-1960s, the governing assumption was that the State would assume one-half of the funding responsibility for its community colleges. Reality has been harshly different. Currently, only 17 percent of the College's revenue comes from the State. Further, the State has developed a funding system for its community colleges that redistributes income from higher income and more wealthy districts such as District 502 to lower income and less wealthy districts. The net effect is very much similar to that of K-12 school funding equalization programs that exist in many states. **Funding equalization, *per se*, may be a worthy principle, however, this funding model operates to the detriment of the College of DuPage and it should exercise its political power to seek adjustments**. Since the overall level of funding that the State of Illinois provides its community colleges is comparatively low, the College should devote time and political attention to increasing that level, perhaps to 25 or 33 percent. This would cost the State of Illinois $35-50 million, not an inconsiderable amount, but an amount that is not overwhelming in a budget that approaches $46 billion.

Tuition and Fees

Twenty-six percent of the College's operating revenue comes from tuition and fees. The College's 1999-2000 tuition and fee charge ($32 per quarter hour, which translates to $48 per semester hour) is competitive, though slightly below the median in a national urban/suburban community college context. Consider the following comparisons, which

give substance to the notion that the College continues to be a bargain price wise. In our view, it is not outlandish for the College to consider moderate increases in tuition.

Glendale CC, CA	$13
Honolulu CC, HI	$33
Miami-Dade CC, FL	$44
College of DuPage	$48 per hour (quarters converted to semesters)
Triton CC, IL	$48
Virginia Community College System	$48
City CC of Chicago	$51
CC of Rhode Island	$58
Henry Ford CC, MI	$63
Bucks County CC. PA	$75
Nassau CC, NY	$79

The bottom line is that the College's revenue structure is likely to change in the future. State funding is unlikely to increase dramatically, while property tax-based revenue is likely to stall. This will place increasing pressure on the College to increase tuition and fees in order to maintain the quality of its offerings. We do not regard this as an unreasonable action, but such increases should be accompanied by reasonable increases in fees that are user based, for example, those that relate to community use of the College's services ranging from the Library to fitness facilities. No doubt increased fees will elicit some howls of protest; however, they are one way to transmit the message that free or below market priced resources cannot be delivered indefinitely if state tax support and property tax-based support stagnate. Well chosen fee increases are be one way to focus public attention on the College's revenue problems.

On the expenditure side of the picture, the College spends 55 percent of its budget on activities that it classifies as instruction and academic support. This is lower than many community colleges and is at least partially due to the significant proportion of its budget (12

percent) that the institution spends on plant operations and maintenance. The spic and span appearance of the campus and its zero deferred maintenance goal do not come without a cost. Even so, based upon national comparisons, we believe that the College should expend closer to 60 percent of its budget on instruction and academic support activities such as the library. We regard this as a somewhat tentative conclusion, however, because of the significant differences that definitions can make in such an analysis. Depending upon the state, an item might be counted as academic support that in another state might be general administration. **All of which is to say that we believe the President should take a long look at the College's resource allocation and how its expenditures are classified in order to reach an informed judgment about whether more resources should be devoted to instruction and related activities.**

IX. INSTITUTIONAL ADVANCEMENT

Fund-raising

It is certainly true that private fund-raising at public community colleges is still new and often ignored by community college boards and administrations. On the other hand, many community and technical colleges across the country have adapted advancement models and fund-raising strategies employed at private and public universities. The College of DuPage is on this course, but considerably more remains to be done.

The College is in the final phase of its first major gifts campaign and revenues of the College Foundation have grown substantially. The campaign included a series of Executive Awareness Sessions with major corporations. The idea was to demonstrate how the College could serve the potential contributors before asking for contributions. This is noteworthy and represents a thoughtful beginning. Plans are that the final phase of the campaign will include greater Foundation Board involvement.

In view of the reputation, resources, location and constituencies of COD, the College has yet to realize the full potential of private giving. A number of facts reinforce this view: the Vice President for Advancement position has been eliminated; the capital campaign goal has been reduced from $7 million to $5 million; the Alumni Association has been disbanded, and there are no annual giving programs (for alumni as well as non-alumni); a "Friends of College of DuPage" campaign, established to replace annual fund-raising with "friendraising" remains dormant; and finally, there is a great deal of ambiguity regarding the overall management and responsibility for fund-raising programs.

A number of the interviewees believe that fund-raising is a relatively low priority at the senior levels of management. Respondents point to inadequate resources, inexperienced staff, conflicting efforts at the College and Foundation, and issues noted above as evidence supporting this conclusion.

A particular example is the profile of the senior staff member charged with managing the capital campaign. In addition to a lack of any substantial major gift fund-raising experience or training, the staff member has at least three other major responsibilities (serving as "Assistant to the President," "Legislative Liaison" and "Manager of Corporate Relations," in addition to running the Major Gifts Campaign). Reporting relationships and responsibilities are unclear. This is especially true because of the elimination of the Advancement Vice President, some new direct reporting relations to the College President, and comments made concerning conflicting efforts by the "Foundation" and the Resource Development staff.

Foundation Board

There is little or no working relationship between the Board of Trustees and the Foundation Board. The Foundation Board at COD has virtually no impact on policy or governance issues. The Foundation Board is only charged with overall responsibility for fund-raising, and a yet to be implemented "fund-raising" strategy. There may be stronger – more subtle relationships between individual board members and trustees, however, we were unable to learn about this from the respondents (We did revisit with the Director of Resource Development in order to fully respond.)

We did not get a sense that "*money or giving inclinations*" were a problem with the Foundation Board. The Foundation Board has made substantial personal gifts to the campaign and is trying to maximize their corporate affiliated gifts. Three survey respondents talked about the increase in quality or "*high caliber*" of new Foundation Board members. A strategy for recruiting additional members that are prepared to give personal gifts, and solicit and cultivate other prospects appears to be working.

The central problem in fund-raising is how the area should be organized to the most efficient and productive advantage. It is the primary reason why we see fundamental problems in the prospects for private support. The two major issues concern: conflicting and confusing organizational and reporting relationships, and an understaffed advancement department.

Reporting relations and organization: Currently there are three "perceived" fund-raising "organizations," i.e., the Foundation, the President's office and the Office of Resource Development. Staff and volunteers are confused about "*who is in charge*." The Campaign Manager reports to the Foundation and to the President. The Director of Resource Development reports to the Vice President for Advancement and to the Foundation Board, depending upon the fund-raising issue at hand. **The Fund-raising function is decentralized at best and confusing at worst.** The retirement of the Vice President for Advancement (and elimination of this position) compounds the problem.

Understaffed Advancement Department: Most staff associated with fund-raising at COD believe that more staff are required to realize the full potential of private support. Traditional functional areas or donor segments including annual giving, planned giving and grant writing are not staffed. There is strong support for an "administrative position" at the Foundation that would be responsible for day-to-day operations.

There is a definite need for additional training for fund-raising staff, both Boards, and senior administration. CASE conferences and various fund-raising publications would help. We believe that customized training programs and an advancement retreat would be timely and more helpful for the Foundation Board, advancement staff and the College president.

Public and Government Relations

The Public Relations Department is perceived as an effective group that does a good job of promoting the College through media relations, advertising and a nationally recognized publications program (many CASE awards!). While there appears to be a major emphasis on PR (they have adequate resources, access to decision-makers, etc.) there is little or no formal marketing beyond the traditional admissions related activities. There is some sentiment that COD is really not "*perceived to be as good as it really is*" due to the lack of institutional or image marketing programs. One corporate donor suggested using the College-owned radio station to promote the College.

The government relations function is very effective. Although, the legislative liaison role is multi-faceted (also functions as senior-staff person for campaign, corporate relations, etc.) according to our interviews the President does a first-rate job of carrying the message to elected and appointed officials who hold him and the College in high regard. All colleges should stand so tall. According to this Review, no college president in the state is more highly thought of. The President's ability is a promising portent for the extraordinary potential for private support. This ability thoughtfully applied from a revised organizational and personnel base could eventually put COD among the top community colleges in the country in private support programs.

Alumni Affairs

There is little to report here. The Alumni Association has been disbanded. A new organization "Friends of College of DuPage" has replaced the Alumni Association. The stated goal of this organization is to make friends and to explore *"in-kind"* opportunities. As stated in another section of this report, this campaign or "friendmaking" effort has yet to be initiated.

In view of the very positive comments from students, alumni and donors, there is serious question about the decision to discontinue any formal fund-raising or other programming with the alumni of COD.

X. INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Intercollegiate athletics ordinarily do not merit a mention in evaluative reports about community colleges since many community colleges do not sponsor intercollegiate athletic teams. At College of DuPage, however, intercollegiate athletics unfortunately have become a significant part of the institution's story in recent years because of the evident interest in them portrayed by several members of the Board of Trustees. There is a consensus on the campus and elsewhere that this attention has not reflected credit either on the College or the Board.

Currently, the College sponsors 15 intercollegiate sports----eight for men and seven for women. COD has won a number of national championships and boasts many regional and conference championships. In 2000, both its men's and women's basketball teams are ranked among the nation's elite. It is football, baseball, and wrestling, however, that may have garnered even more attention in recent years.

In 1996, the President terminated the College's football program, citing a number of problems. These included: (1) noticeably poor academic performances by football players; (2) numerous football players were recruited from outside of District 502; (3) the College was spending about $120,000 annually on football; and, (4) so many other Illinois community colleges had dropped football that only four others still sponsored the sport. His decision to terminate the team was reasonable, intelligent, and even brave in light of the College's nationally ranked teams.

However, the elimination of football angered some in the community; subsequently, the Board restored football to the dismay of many members of the campus community. Few, if any, decisions made by the Board in recent years have evoked such disdain from the regional power structure than the restoration of football. This decision appeared to represent a critical choice between academic and athletic endeavors and to suggest that the academic and social problems associated with the previous football program were, after all, not that important. Further, while

the College reports that it spends only $120,000 annually on a cash basis on football, many members of the campus community believe the real total is much higher because the College chooses to ignore many costs that it incurs in other budgets, including items such as water, electricity, maintenance, and general overhead costs. Even those individuals who do not quibble about the amount of money being spent believe that the sum would be better spent converting part-time faculty positions into full-time positions, supporting the ESL program, or whatever. Regardless, the Board has spent dozens of hours debating the football issue and these are hours and attention that have been badly needed on other topics.

The baseball circumstance relates to the termination of the team's head coach for allegations that we will not discuss here. The Board has been intensely critical of this personnel action and a staggering majority of individuals on the campus believe that some Board members are *"out to get"* the athletic director because of his termination of the coach. It was reported that there was a "*scathing attack on the athletic director*" at an open Board meeting. Absent an absolutely tremendous emergency, to have a board member attack a specific employee at a public board meeting is an unheard of practice and should never occur. Once again, the Board's attention has been diverted to an issue that clearly is not policy-making in nature and is ephemeral to the College's major needs and problems. **Further, the Board should not involve itself in an individual personnel action unless that matter comes to it as a part of an appeal mandated by its own regulations. If not, then it should not only trust its President and administration to handle personnel matters, but also should demand that they do so.**

Similarly, the wrestling situation would hardly be worthy of mention except that, once again, it has captured a totally unreasonable amount of attention of the Board. This is a Board that by all odds should be focusing on strategic topics such as ESL, information technology training, the College's future revenue picture, distance learning, the part-time/full-time faculty ratio, fund raising, and the like, and not upon wrestling, which is a ludicrous issue for the Board of a 34,000 student institution to give anything more than a passing glance.

We believe that this Board should recognize that intercollegiate athletics ought to be a

minor part of the life of a community college and that, in any case, the operation of intercollegiate athletic programs should be left to the administration of the College. **If the Board truly wishes to affect positively the lives of a large number of its students, then it should urge the President to reallocate the money its spends on intercollegiate athletics to intramural athletics (which will touch far more students and, according to empirical evidence, build just as much community) and to adult fitness programs, which unassailably will have a beneficial effect on many more students and citizens than intercollegiate athletics.**

The bottom line is that this Board should ease back from the topic of intercollegiate athletics and concentrate its attention on issues that truly will impact the welfare of the citizens of District 502. If the Board has become an *"embarrassment,"* as charged, then its preoccupation with intercollegiate athletics and related meddling in the internal operations of the institution represent a visible element in that decline from grace.

XI. CAMPUS GOVERNANCE

Five campus governance or "relationship" organizations of note exist on the College of DuPage campus. The most influential of these organizations are the Faculty Senate and the CPA (Classified Personnel Association), but they are joined, variously, by student government, an organization that represents administrators, and PIEC (Partners in Educational Change), a group that contains representatives from a variety of constituencies.

Interviewees said that there are more committees and meetings than in the past, but little apparent movement on issues. There is, they claim, little evidence that those involved in these discussions have any impact on decisions. The pace of planning and decision-making is too slow. The planning process has been changed several times. Decisions are hard to come by. Things are "*extremely collaborative*" to the point of not getting things done.

As described by faculty, administrators and classified staff; the governance structure is simultaneously inclusive and essentially dysfunctional. There are many committees; they meet regularly; they do not produce results. This has produced frustration (e.g., Why can't anything get done?) and distrust (e.g., This is all window dressing.). "*...some of it (decisions) seem to come out of nowhere...*" There is lots of opportunity to address issues and you "*...don't hear any more about it.*"

There were calls for more participation – but only if it is honest and meaningful. There were calls for more communication – but it must address important issues and be consistently available. There were calls for more decision-making. Over and over again, interviewees stated that decisions were not made and, if they were, interviewees claim they were not informed. People know things are changing and they claim they do not know how.

Faculty in particular are extremely critical of decision-making at the College. They acknowledge that the governance structure is inclusive. However, they believe that decisions are not made in a timely manner – if at all – and that their involvement does not reflect a genuine

interest in their contributions. They cite the reorganization and the planning process as two examples of the governance process as ineffectual or manipulative. Administrators, too, spoke to the confusion and uncertainty about the status of the reorganization – believing that this could have been avoided through more direct and timely communication.

Let's look more closely at the design for campus governance. The Faculty Senate is a relatively rare bird in that it deals with both academic issues and collective bargaining issues. A committee of the Senate represents the faculty in its collective bargaining. (The faculty are affiliated with the Illinois Education Association.) While this situation may have been generally workable at the College, we do not believe it to be optimal, and neither do many faculty and administrators. *"When the Senate gets involved in negotiating, it tends to forget about everything else,"* remarked a senior faculty member. Multiple faculty members told us they believe that academic and related issues get short shrift on the campus because the Senate spends too much time on welfare/bargaining issues. This is an issue of substance that should be examined.

President Murphy has rejiggered campus governance so that groups such as classified staff now claim a seat at most important discussion tables. Staff are appreciative of this yet many are as frustrated as faculty that decisions are rarely made.

Nor are we sanguine about the appearance of PIEC, which is designed to increase campus communication, arbitrate knotty problems that might otherwise go unsolved, and mediate campus dilemmas. All important campus constituencies are members of PIEC. It remains to be seen whether it will work as designed and we fear that difficult choices and issues might be referred to PIEC in the future, where the result will be a maximum of talk and a minimum of action. As noted above, College of DuPage is not notable for the speed or decisiveness of many of its actions. It tends to study things to death and seems to value sometimes elusive consensus over concrete results.

We believe the College would be better served with a single primary governance body (a College Council?) under the President which would include representatives from all constituent

groups, faculty (a clear majority), students and classified staff, and would make recommendations to the President, or through other institutional officers designated by the President. The President would then, when appropriate, make recommendations to the Board of Trustees. Key administrators assigned by the President would serve on this body, but ex officio and non-voting. Other organizations would serve separate groups on campus (faculty, students, support staff) and would participate in decision-making both through the Council and separately as the case may be (i.e., contract negotiations). In this arrangement the campus community would have a voice in matters that affect them under the final authority of the President, yet affairs could be conducted more efficiently and decisions reached more expeditiously. Obviously, the present Senate would be reorganized and the PIEC would be eliminated, and a new group (a faculty organization) would handle welfare/bargaining issues. It is important to note that this design is both more efficient and consistent with the 1966 AAUP Statement on Shared Governance.

Board of Trustees

We already have pointed out that the reputation of the Board of Trustees is under question from virtually all interested parties, both on and off campus. **Many of its actions provide text book case studies of how a board of control should *not* exercise its responsibilities.** The Board is divided, publically contentious, and persistently guilty of inappropriate interference in the College's daily internal operations. Several Board members are reported to be fixated on single issues which, as one faculty member correctly observed, *"are not even in the top 100 of the most important issues facing this College today."* All too often, the Board has consistently failed to take a strategic and long term view of the institution and instead has devoted many hours of valuable Board meeting time to almost extraneous issues such as football and wrestling.

Few interviewees had anything positive to say about the Board of Trustees. *"They are embarrassing." "This is the worst Board in 30 years." "By far, this is the worst Board we've ever had."* The Board is severely criticized for its micro-management and personal agendas. It is considered to be a "*split*" board.

Board members are viewed as not looking out for the College and not supportive of the

administration. The Board is "*...not what it used to be ... more combative ... less planning.*" "*The Board's public performance is poor.*" "*It airs its laundry in public.*" "*The Board does not acknowledge the strength of the administration and does not respect the administration.*" "*The Board is perceived as not giving the President a chance to lead.*"

Knowingly or not, the Board of Trustees has seriously damaged the ability of its President to lead the College because of its tendency to micromanage the institution and to become involved in issues that have nothing to do with its appropriate policy-making role. Further, the Board has actively encouraged members of the campus community to ignore the President and come directly to them. Rather than treat the President as the responsible and accountable leader of the campus, they often treat him as just another employee whose opinion is no more valuable than that of any other individual. This apparent lack of respect that several members of the Board exhibit for the President is destructive of his leadership and authority. One must ask, can this Board hold the President responsible and accountable for the campus when it persistently submarines him, bypasses him, and gratuitously ignores him in critical situations? Can this Board evaluate the President when it repeatedly diminishes his effectiveness by its own actions? Can this Board expect strong, decisive recommendations and decisions to emanate from the President if he realistically has no assurance that he will have the Board's support? **We believe that the answer to all three of these questions is, "*The Board cannot*," and hence it must bring these behaviors to an immediate halt**.

One of the foremost needs of the Board of the College of DuPage is to learn more about the appropriate roles of college governing boards in general, and individual college board members in particular. There are some things that boards must do, other things that they may choose to do, and still other things that they should not do. In our opinion, at present, this Board frequently does not know which is which, and it has assembled a bad record of veering off onto issues and topics that nearly always fall into the "*should not do*" category. Additionally, several Board members are not able to differentiate between appropriate and reasonable questioning of administrators and destructive, productivity-killing adversarial relationships with the same administrators. And, these Board members must come to understand that they pound a nail in the

coffin of administrative effectiveness every time they bypass the President under the guise of *"finding out what is going on."*

It was reported that several Board members are almost obsessive about evaluating the President and seek to do this at every opportunity by questioning members of the campus community. A veteran faculty member was on target when he said, *"XXXX [name of Board member omitted] is always trolling for dirt."* There is an appropriate time and place for the evaluation of the President. An annual evaluation based upon goals adopted the previous year is appropriate. The Board should establish a subcommittee to do this evaluation. The President should recommend goals for the next year which are finally mutually adopted by both the President and the Board. Every four years, a more comprehensive evaluation of the entire College should be commissioned (similar to this Review), only one aspect of which is the President's performance. The point is, however, that no college president can survive and remain effective if he/she is being evaluated arbitrarily and non-scientifically on a frequent, though hit or miss, basis. A governing board that persists in doing so will literally get what it has ordained by such behavior----a weak, vacillating president without vision who is constantly looking over his/her back.

In light of these problems and challenges, what should the Board do? **First, it should hold an annual retreat facilitated by a highly knowledgeable and experienced governance authority who has no previous interest in the affairs of the College.** The authority should explore in detail the history of college governing boards, their historical functions, and both the theory and empirical evidence on governing boards and presidents that has accumulated over time. For a precis of these matters, the Board should read Chapters Sixteen through Twenty One of Fisher and Koch, *Presidential Leadership: Making a Difference.* Simply put, several members of the Board of Trustees of the College of DuPage currently operate on the basis of misconceptions about their own duties and do not appear to have any significant understanding of the roles of governing boards and their members. If the Board is not willing to employ and listen carefully to such a facilitator and consultant, then it is destined for more strife, increasing public ridicule, and declining College and presidential effectiveness. Students and the citizens of District

502 will be the ultimate losers.

Second, the Board, as individuals or as a group, should visit the meetings of the governing boards of other colleges and universities, both public and private institutions, that are acknowledged to be well run to see how they do it. It is appropriate for the Board to talk with the members of these boards and their presidents to acquire knowledge and ideas about what is, and is not, appropriate behavior. We will supply suggestions of such governing boards if this Board is interested.

Third, the Board should consider appointing a permanent outside advisor who will be available to College of DuPage Board members and the President. This mentor should be consulted regularly by the Board Chair and the President, and periodically by other Board members as the occasion demands. Such a mentor could provide current COD board members and the President with valuable perspective and wisdom.

Perhaps several members of the Board of Trustees of the College may regard these recommendations as presumptuous or unnecessary. In our view, however, both they and the Board as a whole should not delude themselves about the problems they face and the increasing disrepute in which they are held. Better that the Board take timely action now than to face stigma in the future when its affairs could become totally dysfunctional.

PRESIDENT MICHAEL MURPHY

President Michael T. Murphy is a friendly, engaging, personable leader who seems to care about individuals. To many he is admired for his concern for individual faculty members, staff members who encounter difficulties, or students who face challenges inside or outside of the College. *"He even remembers my birthday!* bragged a middle level administrator. *"He's the first top level administrator I have ever known who really seems to care whether or not I succeed,"* commented a faculty member. *"He's on our side, and we know it,"* asserted another faculty member.

The President speaks of creating a sense of community at College of DuPage and has taken pains to include as many elements of the College's diverse constituencies in his decision-making. Classified staff, in particular, revel in the increased attention that he has given them and in the fact that they are invited to meetings and gatherings where previously they were excluded. PIEC (Partners in Educational Change) is an outgrowth of his desire to include all major campus constituencies in the most important issues on the campus and, at the same time, to address ongoing problems that perhaps have festered on the campus for years. Dr. Murphy seems to believe that reasonable people can ameliorate differences and improve their circumstances if they can find clearly define their concerns, walk in each others' shoes, and conscientiously find common ground. The verdict on PIEC is still out and one senior faculty member was convinced that it did not work as well as the "*old days*" when decisions were made expeditiously and the College was able to move, but then said, *"This may work, but it doesn't yet."*

It must also be noted that there are a number at the College, both faculty and staff, who believe that the President is "*indecisive, vacillating at times, defensive and contentious.*" Some felt that he "*was inconsistent*" in his positions and attempted to surround himself with "*yes*" people who were afraid to disagree with him. These perceptions, however, are undoubtedly due, in some measure, to the role and disposition of the Board of Trustees.

Dr. Murphy assumed the College of DuPage presidency in 1995. Since that time, the membership of the College's Board of Trustees has changed dramatically. As we have detailed, the current Board has unfortunately assembled a record of public discord, significant intrusion into internal campus affairs, a frequent focus on issues that are trivial and have little impact upon the long-term prosperity of the College, and what is interpreted by many as hostility toward the President himself.

Under the guise of "*representing the citizens,*" several members of the Board have vitiated the President's authority and diminished his ability to lead. When this condition is combined with Dr. Murphy's tendency to seek consensus by means of extensive campus discussion and

participation, this has led to what one member of the Faculty Senate has termed *"institutional drift."* Other interviewees called it "*paralysis by analysis*" or a "*swamp of indecision.*" As a consequence, many members of the campus community believe that important decisions are being deferred and that the College is not addressing its rapidly changing environment as promptly as it should. The same individuals often praise the President's desire to include them in discussions, but ultimately conclude that *"process has trumped results,"* as an administrator put it.

In the President's defense, it is apparent that the actions and attitudes of several members of the Board of Trustees make it difficult for him to take action, and make firm decisions, because he may well be uncertain about the Board's support. No college president wants to find him/herself on the end of a limb that his/her Board saws off at the first opportunity. Thus, many members of the campus community are forgiving of what they perceive to be a lack of dynamic, forceful leadership from the President. *"If he really did take a tough stand on something, they would make him regret it,"* predicted a faculty leader.

If the College of DuPage were already a basket case, metaphorically speaking, and a series of academic and financial disasters had recently ensued under President Murphy's leadership, then one could better understand the often adversarial, seemingly distrustful demeanor that several members of the Board exude. On the contrary, our own investigations and the comments of knowledgeable individuals nationally in the state, the region and on the campus, reveal that the College is extremely well regarded and that it is even seen as a model by other community colleges. Hence, the public is entitled to ask, "*If nothing of real significance at the College is broken, then why do some members of the Board continually try to fix things?*" In putting forward this question, we do not argue that the College is without flaws and challenges. And, we do not assert that all aspects of President Murphy's stewardship have been perfect. Rather, our point is that both performance of the College and the President do not merit the degree of bad feelings that some Board members' behavior have generated.

On the basis of this review, we believe that the Board should place increased confidence in the President and charge him with leading the College in consonance with

goals adopted jointly by the President and the Board, subject only to Board policies and applicable laws and regulations. The President, in turn, should involve the Board in meaningful discussions concerning the College's salient problems, challenges, and successes. The President should take care to keep the Board well informed about the most important aspects of the College's life. But, the Board should not look over the President's shoulder and should give him freedom to lead and to make decisions. If he does not lead, or does not make timely or wise decisions based on mutually accepted goals, then he should be so evaluated. The President should not be held responsible for the welfare and administration of the College if his power to lead the institution has been compromised by Board behavior and counterproductive governance habits that effectively destroy his ability to lead.

At the College of DuPage, it is imperative that both the Board and the President play their proper role, for none can be seen clearly and honestly in the present light. The Board needs to hold a retreat on roles and relationships in the near future. That retreat should be conducted by a tested, un-invested outsider. From this new definition of roles and expectations, the Board should ask the President to prepare a set of goals to be accomplished within a specified timeframe (i.e., August 1, 2000, July 31, 2001). These proposed goals should be discussed with the Board Chair and then the full Board where they may be amended, modified or expanded. Finally, after all parties are in agreement with the goals, the Board should back off completely, allow the President to run the institution, and at the end of the timeframe, evaluate the President in light of these goals. If he performs well, he should be applauded; if he is so-so, he should be so advised and his course should be changed in the next timeframe; and, if he is way off course, he should be dismissed. This means that Board members on both sides must stop any "*quality control*" and other micro-managing behavior and stand united in the course of an intelligent and tested design for the conduct of the College.

XII. RECOMMENDATIONS (These recommendations are further qualified in the body of this Review.)

1. The notion (as stated in the 1999-2001 *Catalog*) that students might usefully choose among 16 different English courses to satisfy the Humanities requirement, or among six different Psychology courses to fulfill the Social and Behavioral Sciences requirement, is not a sound one. It is nearly impossible for the College to evaluate the effectiveness of its General Education Core Curriculum if there is little common educational experience among the students who complete the Core. Ordinarily, no academic discipline should offer more than two courses within the Core. These courses ought to be rigorously defined and developed, constantly assessed, and given high priority. Such attention is much less likely if dozens of courses are involved. Ultimately, the College ought to be able to demonstrate that its students are learning, that they are attaining specific educational goals, and that specific courses either do (or do not) help the College achieve these outcomes. We recommend that the College pare its Core course offerings, spend more time evaluating and assessing its courses, and refuse to accept on faith that specific courses or course sequences actually work.

2. About distance learning: It should be apparent that students now have the ability to compare collegiate offerings (price, quality, access, service, etc.) to an extent they never had before. Some believe that this will turn the college marketplace upside down. But, it already has made a difference and could have profound negative effects on College of DuPage if it is not prepared. Further discussion should take place and tentative decisions made and confirmed both on the campus and by the Board of Trustees.

3. The College should offer more opportunities for faculty to expand technology in the classroom.

4. The College should examine where and how it is using part-time faculty, how it is compensating them, and (especially) how it is recruiting, training, supervising, and evaluating them. The key to obtaining excellent performance from part-time and adjunct

faculty is to not ignore them. As much as possible, the College should treat them as it does it full-time faculty: train and orient them, support them, supervise, observe, and evaluate them, include them in departmental and area meetings, assign them mentor colleagues, and listen to them.

5. The current levels of faculty salaries that the College is paying its full-time faculty are generally adequate; however, in specific academic disciplines (for example, those relating to technology and some in the health sciences), problems exist. Further, we note that better than average salaries are necessary if the College wants to maintain its status as a distinctly better than average community college. Ultimately, the College will get what it pays for in the area of faculty salaries and it should not expect to employ a substantial number of individuals with the talent and dedication of those who joined the faculty decades ago if its faculty salaries merely approach national averages.

6. Some problems exist in the salaries that are paid to part-time and adjunct faculty members. The College's rate of compensation per credit hour is greater than that paid by most other community colleges in Illinois. However, these rates may be insufficient in the Chicago metropolitan area and in certain disciplines.

7. The College should increase the extent to which its faculty salary structure reflects merit and market principles. The College does not give all of its students a C grade in their classes, yet it tends to give most faculty members the same raise, regardless of their performance. In the words of one faculty member, who has found the College's current merit salary process complicated and bureaucratic, *"They need to make it [merit salary payments] more attractive and less complicated."*

8. We believe that the College's administration would be well advised to develop and publicize a plan that speaks to its intentions to replace retiring full-time faculty members. This topic is a concern with many non-retiring faculty and should not be ignored.

9. Earlier in the 1990s, data suggested that the College's students often did not fare as well academically as the students from other community colleges when they transferred to Illinois public universities. More recent data no longer show this trend, which in any case might have been due to a variety of demographic, economic, and social factors quite unconnected to the quality of the College's instruction. Even so, we urge the College to continue to monitor closely the performance of the students that it sends to senior institutions, as well as to examine in detail the performance of its students on certification examinations.

10. The College should implement an aggressive and comprehensive Diversity Plan with targets, time-lines, human and fiscal resources, and appropriate consequences for inaction. Efforts should be made to increase the diversity of faculty and staff. Commitment to diversity begins at the top.

11. Data suggest that the College appears to have more administrators than many other community colleges in Illinois, at least on a per student FTE basis. However, this could be a function of the way in which positions are labeled. On most community college campuses, department chairpersons exist and such individuals are classified as faculty. At College of DuPage, however, no such positions exist. Instead, a series of associate deanships have been established that in effect roll several department chairperson positions into one. This is an area that should be examined in detail and appropriate comparative data assembled from comparable urban/suburban community colleges nationally.

12. The administrative reorganization should be implemented as soon as possible. Absent circumstances of which we are unaware, the Board and the campus should support these changes. One cannot hold a President responsible for leadership and administration if at the same time one imposes someone else's administrative organization and notions of how things should work, nor can a President hold delegates accountable without clear lines of delegated responsibility and authority. The Board should support his choices in this regard and then hold him responsible for responsible, timely, and effective administration.

13. The President should present an embracing vision for the College, define a vision for the College's future, build commitment to that vision through a streamlined strategic planning and resource allocation process, and be prepared to take the risks required to achieve that vision, on campus and in the external environment.

14. The President should identify areas where immediate decisions are essential and actions should be taken. The College community should be informed immediately. Based on the interviews, these are likely to include the reorganization, action to fill administrative positions opening because of retirements, and (less clear) conclusions associated with strategic planning efforts.

15. The President should identify those decisions that are still in play and establish deadlines by which they will be made and honor those deadlines and inform the College community quickly and decisively.

16. The College must find ways to pose substantive issues and reach decisions concerning important issues much more promptly than it has in the past. Many of the College's constituents laud and appreciate the participative, collaborative style that the President has introduced to the campus. Frequently, however, this style has not generated timely decisions, and sometimes no decision at all. We believe that the future agenda of the College should continue to seek widespread participation, but at the same time invoke clear deadlines for commentary and ensure that decisions are neither delayed nor avoided. No institution of higher education of which we are aware has succeeded for long periods of time on the basis of rule by committee. Campus consensus is laudable and a generally desirable outcome. Nonetheless, an unremitting search for consensus often tends to eliminate bold actions, diminishes or eliminates intelligent risk-taking, and often results in what one higher education authority has labeled "*lowest common denominator solutions*." The 21st century is unlikely to reward institutions that are laggard and extremely risk averse. This style is wearing thin.

17. We believe the College would be better served with a single primary governance body (a College Council?) under the President which would include representatives from all constituent groups, faculty (a clear majority), students and classified staff, and would make recommendations to the President, or through other institutional officers designated by the President. The President would then, when appropriate, make recommendations to the Board of Trustees. Key administrators would serve on this body, but ex officio and non-voting. Other organizations would serve separate groups on campus (faculty, students, support staff) and would participate in decision-making both through the Council and separately as the case may be (i.e., contract negotiations). In this arrangement the campus community would have a voice in matters that affect them under the final authority of the President, yet affairs could be conducted more efficiently and decisions reached more expeditiously. Obviously, the present Senate would be reorganized and the PIEC would be eliminated, and a new group (a faculty organization) would handle welfare/bargaining issues.

18. The President should spend more time with Board members to build the Board agenda and to build support for agenda items. Is the Board focusing on small issues because the administration has not made the case for the importance of the big issues?

19. The College should take the bold step of announcing that the College calendar will be changed to three 16-week terms – with each term further divided into four, eight and twelve-week blocks – effective fall 2001. Appoint an implementation committee with clearly established goals, objectives and time-lines. Sell the change to all necessary constituent groups through studies educational statesmanship.

20. During the past year, campus security personnel, backed by a variety of other individuals, have requested the right to carry guns while on duty. This request has divided the campus. We have two observations to make. First, we believe that it was and is inappropriate for campus security personnel to bypass the President and the

administration to publicize and promote their position. Further, we believe that it is unacceptable for campus security personnel to attempt to organize opposition to a president on this issue, or to attempt to influence a board on this issue. This is particularly true if security officers were aware of such conditions before accepting employment. They must deal with their supervisors and with the President. Of all areas of an organization, security officers should exercise constraint and discipline.

However, although this decision should be the President's, in general, we believe that it is appropriate for thoroughly trained campus security personnel to carry arms. American campuses and metropolitan areas today are unpredictably dangerous and security officers must be prepared. However, by thoroughly trained, we mean – at a minimum – that any officer must have successfully completed the equivalent of a state police academy in order to be eligible to carry a gun. Even then, depending upon the officer's assignments, carrying a gun might well not be necessary. Thus, not all officers necessarily should be authorized or permitted to carry a gun. And, in order to continue to carry a gun, an officer must complete periodic retraining, weapons and firing range training, and the like. Carrying a gun, then, must be a revocable privilege rather than a right of every security officer. In the end with such a policy both the College and its people will be better protected.

21. The classified staff, in addition to feeling overworked, want more documents (in abbreviated form) like the January 2000 *Institutional Review: President's Report*. Classified claim that this document is a "*first*." They indicated that if any one thing could emerge from this evaluation, it should be providing them with more and better information. They point to the institutional e-mail as a wasted resource because everything from gripes to bake sales are on e-mail, with no means to sort the important from the unimportant and nothing to guide them to information they might need, especially from senior officers.

22. The most serious financial challenges for the College in the future relate to the changing (and perhaps stagnant) sources of its $86+ million annual operating revenue. If, after thorough consultation, the conclusion is that a tax rate increase is called for, the

College should recruit prominent public citizens, business firms, and political leaders to sell this need to the voting public.

23. Since the overall level of funding that the State of Illinois provides its community colleges is comparatively low, the College should devote time and political attention to increasing that level, perhaps to 25 or 33 percent. This would cost the State of Illinois $35-50 million, not an inconsiderable amount, but an amount that is not overwhelming in a budget that approaches $46 billion.

24. Twenty-six percent of the College's operating revenue comes from tuition and fees. The College's 1999-2000 tuition and fee charge ($32 per quarter hour, which translates to $48 per semester hour) is competitive, though slightly below the median in a national urban/suburban community college context. In our view, the College should consider moderate increases in tuition.

25. The College spends 55 percent of its budget on activities that it classifies as instruction and academic support. This is lower than many community colleges and is at least partially due to the significant proportion of its budget (12 percent) that the institution spends on plant operations and maintenance. The spic and span appearance of the campus and its zero deferred maintenance goal do not come without a cost. Even so, based upon national comparisons, we believe that the College should expend closer to 60 percent of its budget on instruction and academic support activities such as the library. We regard this as a somewhat tentative conclusion, however, because of the significant differences that definitions can make in such an analysis. Depending upon the state, an item might be counted as academic support that in another state might be general administration. All of which is to say that we believe the President should take a long look at the College's resource allocation and how its expenditures are classified in order to reach an informed judgment about whether more resources should be devoted to instruction and related activities.

26. We recommend consolidating all fund-raising functions under one senior staff member (the Director of Resource Development could be that person). This position reports to the President after departure of the Vice President for Advancement. Have an administrative assistant to manage day-to-day Foundation functions (report to Director of Resource Development).

The advancement staff needs to be enlarged to include more attention and responsibility for additional major gifts, planned giving and corporate/foundation relations. COD may need a stronger proposal/grants writing function a well.

27. We recommend a review of the alumni annual giving program and consideration of re-establishing the Alumni Association.

28. There is a definite need for additional training for fund-raising staff, both boards, and the senior administration. CASE conferences and various fund-raising publications would help. Customized training programs and an advancement retreat would be timely and more helpful for the Foundation Board, advancement staff and the College president.

29. The President should establish an ad hoc group on governance (and include faculty (majority), classified staff and students) to consider the governance design offered above and/or to recommend ways in which the decision-making process can yield conclusions in a more timely manner and more efficient ways to communicate those decisions more successfully to the College community.

30. The President should examine the current forms of communication outside the governance structure (e.g., weekly print communication from the president, e-mail, informational meetings) to determine whether they are effective. Based on the interviews, they are sorely lacking. Consideration might be given to establishing (or improving) routine presidential communication with the College Community: making more focused use of e-mail, providing weekly print material that is brief, clear and informative about official college matters (and goes beyond kudos and urging charitable giving).

31. For the good of the College, we believe that some members of the Board of Trustees of the College of DuPage must change the very assumptions upon which they base their Board responsibilities and further that they absolutely must change their public behavior. Yes, every college president must be held accountable and this Review is one of the means by which this accountability should be obtained. However, several members of the Board must cease and desist from their persistent interference in the internal operations of the College, focus instead on policy-making, permit the President to administer and lead the College subject to annual evaluation and accountability and terminate the public carping and criticism that they levy against each other and against the President. The College is not likely to come to grips with the significant changes in the environment of higher education that we noted above if its Board spends its time focusing on internal squabbles, backbiting, "*one-upmanship*" of the President, and pedestrian decisions about items such as the wrestling team. There are dozens of vital issues that are more important and the citizens and the students of the College deserve better.

32. We believe that this Board should recognize that intercollegiate athletics ought to be a minor part of the life of a community college and that, in any case, the operation of intercollegiate athletic programs should be left to the administration of the College. If the Board truly wishes to affect positively the lives of a large number of its students, then it should urge the President to reallocate the money its spends on intercollegiate athletics to intramural athletics (which will touch far more students and, according to empirical evidence, build just as much community) and to adult fitness programs, which unassailably will have a beneficial effect on many more students and citizens than intercollegiate athletics.

33. The Board should not involve itself in an individual personnel action unless that matter comes to it as a part of an appeal mandated by its own regulations. If not, then it should not only trust its President and administration to handle personnel matters, but also should demand that they do so.

34. It was reported that several Board members are almost obsessive about evaluating the President and seek to do this at every opportunity by questioning members of the campus community. A veteran faculty member was on target when he said, "*XXXX (name of Board member omitted) is always trolling for dirt.*" An annual evaluation of the President based upon goals adopted the previous year is appropriate. The Board should establish a subcommittee to do this evaluation. The President should first prepare goals and criteria for the subsequent year and after discussion, emendation or addition, finally be mutually adopted by both the President and the Board. Every four years, a more comprehensive evaluation of the entire College should be commissioned (similar to this Review), only one aspect of which is the President's performance. The point is, however, that no college president can survive and remain effective if he/she is being evaluated arbitrarily and non-scientifically on a frequent, though hit or miss, basis. A governing board that persists in doing so will literally get what it has ordained by such behavior----a weak, vacillating president without vision who is constantly looking over his/her back.

35. In light of these problems and challenges, what should the Board do? First, it should hold an annual retreat facilitated by a highly knowledgeable and experienced governance authority who has no special interest in the affairs of the College. The authority should explore in detail the history of college governing boards, their functions, and both the theory and empirical evidence on governing boards and presidents that has accumulated over time. For a precis of these matters, the Board should read Chapters Sixteen through Twenty One of Fisher and Koch, *Presidential Leadership: Making a Difference.* If the Board is not willing to employ and listen carefully to such a facilitator and consultant, then it is destined for more strife, increasing public ridicule, and declining College and presidential effectiveness. Students and the citizens of District 502 will be the ultimate losers.

36. The Board, as individuals or as a group, should visit the meetings of the governing boards of other colleges and universities, both public and private institutions that are

acknowledged to be well run to see how they do it. It is appropriate for the Board to talk with the members of these boards and their presidents to acquire knowledge and ideas about what is, and is not, appropriate behavior. We will supply suggestions of such governing boards if this Board is interested.

37. The Board should consider appointing the same outside facilitator who will be available to College of DuPage Board members and the President. This mentor should be consulted
regularly by the Board Chair and the President, and periodically by other Board members as the occasion demands.

On the basis of this review, we believe that the Board should place increased confidence in the President and charge him with leading the College in consonance with goals adopted jointly by the President and the Board, subject only to evaluation by the Board, approved Board policies, and applicable laws and regulations. The President, in turn, should involve the Board in meaningful discussions concerning the College's salient problems, challenges, and successes. The President should take care to keep the Board well informed about the most important aspects of the College's life. But, the Board should not look over the President's shoulder and should give him freedom to lead and to make decisions. If he does not lead, or does not make timely or wise decisions based on mutually accepted goals, then he should be so evaluated.

Finally, the team believes that all Board of COD members are good intentioned. We talked to none who were not sincere in their commitment to serve in the interests of the College; rather, a number have simply been misguided. This Review recommends a course to alleviate the condition. Lastly, having conducted countless similar Reviews, the reader should bear in mind that the condition described in this Review is not unique to the College of DuPage.

APPENDIX A

James L. Fisher
Review Team Chair
Brief Biography

Dr. Fisher is the most published writer on leadership and organization in higher education today. He has written scores of professional articles and has also been published in such popular media as *The New York Times*, *The Washington Times*, and *The Baltimore Sun*. The author or editor of eight books, his book, *The Board and the President*, "clearly established him as the nation's leading authority on the college presidency," wrote Michael Worth of George Washington University reviewing in *Currents*. His *The Power of the Presidency*, was reviewed in *Change* magazine as "... the most important book ever written on the college presidency" and was nominated for the nonfiction Pulitzer Prize. His most recent book, *Presidential Leadership: Making a Difference*, has been reviewed as "...a major, impressive, immensely instructive book, ...a virtual Dr. Spock for aspiring or new college presidents, and ...a must read for all trustees."

A registered psychologist with a Ph.D. from Northwestern University, Dr. Fisher is President Emeritus of the Council for Advancement & Support of Education (CASE) and President Emeritus of Towson State University. He is presently professor of Leadership Studies at The Union Institute and a consultant to boards and presidents. He has taught at Northwestern, Illinois State, Johns Hopkins, Harvard, and the University of Georgia and has been a consultant to more than three hundred colleges and universities.

Dr. Fisher has been a trustee at ten private colleges and universities and two preparatory schools. A former Marine, he serves as a trustee of the Marine Military Academy. He has received awards for teaching, writing, citizenship and leadership and has been awarded twelve honorary degrees. At Illinois State, The Outstanding Thesis Award was named by the faculty The James L. Fisher Thesis Award. The faculty at Towson State University recommended that the new psychology building be named after Dr. Fisher, and the CASE Distinguished Service to Education Award bears his name.

While president at Towson State, his government relations activities were sufficient to overturn gubernatorial vetoes. *The Baltimore Sun* wrote that he was a "master educational politician....under his leadership, enrollment doubled, quality went up and costs went down." In Washington, *Newsweek* magazine reported that, while President at CASE, his national campaign, The Action Committee for Higher Education (ACHE) resulted in "more than $1 billion in student financial aid." CASE also created and orchestrated the "America's Energy is Mindpower"

campaign, "Higher Education Week" and "The Professor of the Year" awards. For several years, he did a popular daily radio commentary on WBAL in Baltimore and has been an occasional OP/ED feature writer for *The Baltimore Sun*. Through the years, Dr. Fisher has been encouraged by leaders in both parties to run for Governor, Senate or County Executive.

Donald T. Cahill
Brief Biography

Donald T. Cahill is currently Vice President for Institutional Advancement and Enrollment Management at Marian College. Mr. Cahill has over twenty years of experience in planning, directing and managing fund-raising campaigns and marketing efforts for public and private four-year research universities, liberal arts colleges and public community colleges. Mr. Cahill's fund-raising, marketing and public relations experience includes: serving as President of the City Colleges of Chicago Foundation; President, Northwestern Memorial Hospital Foundation; Associate Dean, External Relations and Administration, the Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University. Mr. Cahill has also held University-wide fund-raising positions at Northwestern and Case Western Reserve University.

In addition to his professional experience, Mr. Cahill has served as a lecturer on fund-raising and board relations and as an Adjunct Professor of Not-for-Profit Management at Northwestern University. Mr. Cahill holds a B.A. from Queens College, CUNY, and an MBA from the Kellogg Management School at Northwestern University.

Judith S. Eaton

Brief Biography

Dr. Judith S. Eaton has been president of the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) since August 1997. CHEA is a national organization of more than 3,000 colleges and universities that promotes quality assurance and accountability in higher education through voluntary accreditation. It is located in Washington, DC.

Before joining CHEA, Dr. Eaton was chancellor of the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities system. Previously she served as president of the Council for Aid to Education, vice president of the American Council on Education, president of the Community College of Philadelphia, and president of the Community College of Southern Nevada. She also held positions as a faculty member and administrator at several other institutions.

A frequent contributor to higher education journals and periodicals, Dr. Eaton has edited several publications and is the author of two books: *The Unfinished Agenda: Higher Education in the 1980s* and *Strengthening Collegiate Education in Community Colleges.*

Dr. Eaton holds a bachelor's and a master's degree from the University of Michigan and a doctorate from Wayne State University (MI). She has been awarded three honorary degrees.

James V. Koch

Brief Biography

Dr. James V. Koch became the sixth president of Old Dominion University on July 1, 1990. Prior to coming to Old Dominion University, he was President of the University of Montana (1986-1990). A recent study funded by the Exxon Foundation named Dr. Koch as one of the 100 most effective college presidents in the United States.

Dr. Koch earned a bachelor of arts degree at Illinois State University in 1964 and a Ph.D. in economics at Northwestern University in 1968. He has received honorary doctoral degrees from Toyo University in Tokyo, Japan, Yeungnam University in Taegu, Korea, and Kyushu Institute of Technology, Kitakyushu, Japan. Dr. Koch was employed as a research economist at the Harris Bank in Chicago and has held faculty positions at Illinois State University, California State University at Los Angeles, the University of Grenoble (France), Brown University, and the University of Hawaii.

Dr. Koch has published seven books and over sixty articles in the field of economics. His book, *Industrial Organization and Prices*, published by Prentice-Hall, has been one of the leading texts in the discipline. He is a co-author of the book, *Presidential Leadership* published by the American Council on Education. Dr. Koch has served as a consultant and expert witness for over thirty legal firms.

One of Dr. Koch's most enduring interests and objectives has been utilizing technology to bring higher education to individuals who are place bound. The University's cost-efficient TELETECHNET distance learning system is the largest in the United States and involves a unique partnership with the Virginia Community College System. 4,000 students annually now complete Old Dominion University courses via TELETECHNET by means of interactive television, prolific use of Internet, and sophisticated simulations that are presented live on more than 30 community college campuses. Old Dominion and the community colleges share resources, personnel, space, students, and faculty.

Irving P. McPhail
Brief Biography

Dr. Irving P. McPhail is the chief executive officer of Maryland's largest community college system, consisting of three comprehensive campuses at Catonsville, Dundalk, Essex, and satellite centers at Owings Mills, Hunt Valley, Towson, White Marsh and Point Breeze. His research, teaching, and consulting focus on test-wiseness; effective inner-city, K-12 public schools; and literacy education for diverse populations. His current research is examining culturally-mediated instruction and the implications for literacy education with African-American children, youth and adults. He is the author of *Test-Wiseness Curriculum* (Kamilah Educational Enterprises), and he has published more than 25 scholarly articles, book chapters, and monographs.

Dr. McPhail has been involved with urban education at all levels for the past quarter century. His work with inner-city, K-12 public school teachers across the nation has resulted in curriculum innovation and student success in standardized test performance and reading/language arts achievement. He has demonstrated a commitment to academic excellence and to urban public and private higher education in a multi-cultural, multi-ethnic setting. Dr. McPhail has been a strong and effective advocate for equal employment opportunity, affirmative action, and the promotion of cultural pluralism.

Previously, he was president of St. Louis Community College at Florissant Valley, president of LeMoyne-Owen College, dean of Arts and Science at Wayne County Community College, and provost of Pace University. Additionally, he has held faculty, administrative, and research roles at Delaware State University, The Johns Hopkins University, the University of Maryland at College Park, and Morgan State University. Dr. McPhail served as the chief operating officer of the Baltimore City Public Schools from 1984-85.

Dr. McPhail earned an Ed.D. in Reading/Language Arts from the University of Pennsylvania, an M.A.T. in Reading from the Harvard Graduate School of Education, and a B.S. in Sociology from Cornell University. He was an ACE Fellow in Academic Administration at The Johns Hopkins University in 1978-79, he completed the Harvard I.E.M. program in Summer, 1988, and the Presidents Academy of the American Association of Community Colleges in Summer 1996.

Dr. McPhail is serving a two-year term on the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) Advisory Committee of Presidents. He is also one of 10 chancellors/presidents appointed by the League for Innovation in the Community College to a project on developing and certifying student learning of 21st century skills.

Beverly A. Richardson
Brief Biography

Dr. Beverly A. Richardson is Provost at Mercer County Community College, James Kerney Campus, in Trenton, NJ. Prior to the position of Provost, Dr. Richardson served as Dean for the James Kerney Campus and Dean for Student Services at Mercer County Community College. She has also served as a Special Assistant to the Executive Vice-President and Instructor in the Urban Studies Department at the University of the District of Columbia; Associate and Assistant Dean of Student Affairs at Bentley College; Financial Aid Director at the Harvard University Graduate School of Education; and Director of Financial Aid and Coordinator of Special Admissions at the Massachusetts College of Art.

Dr. Richardson received her Ph.D. in Higher Education Administration from Boston College, her master's degree from Simmons College and her bachelor's degree from Norfolk State College.

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEWEES:

Joy Aaronson, Adjunct Faculty
Asima Abassi, Student
Joyce Abel, Associate Dean
Hilde Achepohl, Faculty
Deb Adrian, Classified Support Staff
Barbara Ahlgrim, Alumna
Brenda Alberico, Faculty
Olivia Albert, Alumna
Ron Ally, Director, Financial Affairs & Controller
Mike Alsup, Lieutenant, Public Safety
Bruce Anderson, DuPage Area Occupational System
Thomas Anton, Alumnus
Val Archer, Classified Staff
John Bachar, Adjunct Faculty
Sudha Balakrishnan, Student
Leslie Barger, Associate Vice President, Academic Services & Community Ed
Joe Barillari, Director
Holly Bartunek, Faculty
Sue Benton, Classified Staff
Georgine R. Berent, Adjunct Faculty
James Bergen, Alumnus
Alan Bergeson, Faculty
Donna Berliner, Classified Staff
Sue Blasi, Director, Admissions, Registration & Records
Tammie Bob, Adjunct Faculty
Pat Bradley, Adjunct Faculty
Sharon Bradwish-Miller, Dean, Continuing Education
Rosul Branislav, Program Coordinator
Ken Bretl, Faculty
Elizabeth Britt, Classified Staff
Bill Brittain, Network Analyst
Eileen Broido, Major Giver

David Brown, Alumnus
Mary Sue Brown, Trustee
Mary Buckley, Classified Staff
Diane M. Bulkeley, Adjunct Faculty
Adair Bullen, Associate Dean
Christine Burdick, Alumna
Judy Burgholzer, Program Coordinator
Val Burke, Classified Staff
Joe Buri, Physical Plant Administrator
Johanna Campanaro, Student
Lisa Capozzoli, Program Coordinator
Dorothy Caracciolo, Program Coordinator
Don Carlson, Program Coordinator
Cleve Carnay, Retired President, DuPage Community Foundation
William Carroll, President, Benedictine University
Gina Carzoli, Adjunct Faculty
Sue Censky, Classified Staff
Aaron Chan, Student
John Charlton, Alumnus
Sophia Chen, Student
Joe Cipfl, Executive Director, ICCB
Judith Coconato, Alumna
Minnie Colon, Student
Marilyn Comer, Director
Peggy Connolly, former Trustee
Nancy Conradt, President elect, Faculty Senate
Catherine Conway, Alumna
Robin Cooper, Football Coach
Ann Cotton, Program Coordinator
Jeff Cowdery, Classified Staff
Mary Lou Cowlishaw, State of Illinois, House of Representatives
Elizabeth Criddell, Student
Jeff Curto, Faculty
Carolyn Dailey, Adjunct Faculty
Ellen Davel, Program Coordinator

Dan Deasy, Classified Staff
Patrick DeMoon, Major Giver
Anita Dickson, Program Coordinator
Roberta diNovi, Faculty
Peter DiTuri, Student
Carolyn Dockus, Faculty
Susan Donahue, Adjunct Faculty
Thomas Doran, Adjunct Faculty
Alison Drake, Program Coordinator
Susan Dreghorn, Adjunct Faculty
Sean Driscoll, Alumnus
Joy Dunigan, Classified Support Staff
Earline Dunn-El, Classified Support Staff
Sherwood Edwards, President, Faculty Senate
Chuck Ellenbaum, Faculty
Scott Engel, Director
Mary Lou Emami, Classified Staff
Al Engeldahl, Program Coordinator
Sue Erzen, Interim Dean, Business and Services
Joanna Escobar, Director
Marjorie Faulkner, Adjunct Faculty
Beverly Fawell, Illinois State Senator (retired)
Aaron Feinblatt, Alumnus
Don Fisher, Foundation Officer
Jan Fix, Classified Staff
Sadie Flucas, Associate Dean
Bernie Fradkin, Dean, Library
Larry Frateschi, Faculty
Teresa Fries, Alumna
Syd Fryer, Director
Terry Fuller, Director
Richard Furlow, Associate Dean
Nancy Gage, Classified Staff
Laura Galto, Classified Staff
Laura Gandolfo, Classified Staff

Patrick Gannon, Student
Marilyn Gebhardt, Adjunct Faculty
Jan Geesaman, Associate Dean
Sandra Geis, Manager, Enterprise Networking
Kathryn Golden, Program Coordinator
Phyllis Goodman, Faculty
Marilyn Gorawara, Major Giver
David Gorski, Classified Staff
Wanda Grabow, Program Coordinator
Brenda Gray, Alumna
Jon Grigalunas, Classified Staff
Roy Grundy, Retired Faculty
Semra Guceri, Adjunct Faculty
Linda Guzzaldo, Alumna
Darryl Haefner, Program Coordinator
Ida Hagman, Program Coordinator
Barbara Hall, Faculty Senate
Ann Halston, City Editor, *Daily Herald*
Marget Hamilton, Director
Jocelyn Harney, Associate Dean, Counseling
Sue Hartman, Classified Staff
Kay Hatcher, Major Giver
Rita Hatcher, Classified Staff
Annette Hathaway, Classified Staff
Catherine Hernbroth, Alumna
Jane Herron, Vice Chair, Board of Trustees
Elaine Hill, Classified Staff
Greg Hill, Classified Support Staff
Robert Horan, Adjunct Faculty
Nickie Horton, Adjunct Faculty
Rachel Hoshaw, Student
Connie Howard-Cannaday, Faculty
Patricia Hoyt, Student
Barbara Huszagh, Adjunct Faculty
Ron Jerak, Faculty Senate

Erica Jimenez, Student
Linda Johansen, Adjunct Faculty
Cherryl Johnson, Classified Staff
Margie Kemper, Classified Support Staff
Nancy Kett, Program Coordinator
Sid Khanvilkar, Student Body President
Ed Kies, Dean, Liberal Arts
Beth King, Student
Russell Kirt, Professor Emeritus
Peter Klassen, Faculty
Nancy Kleir, Classified Support Staff
Jack Knuepfer, former State Senator and County Board Chair
John Kolar, Vice President, Foundation
Ken Kolbet, Vice President, Administrative Affairs
Zinta Konrad, Classified Staff
Irene Kovala, Dean, Alternative Learning
Jacqueline Kozisek, Student
Mary Kranz, Chair, Board of Trustees
Jerry Krusinski, Associate Dean
Patricia Kummer, Adjunct Faculty
Carol Kunkel-Parkin, Adjunct Faculty
Karen Kutz, Daily Herald Reporter
Jennie Labine, Faculty
Sean LaFortune, Student
Paula Landa, Student
Alan Lanning, Faculty
Robert LaRose, Alumnus
Judy Larwill, Classified Support Staff
Christine Legner, Classified Staff
Ron Lemme, Vice President, Planning & Information
Alice Liang, Student Trustee
Tom Lindblade, Program Coordinator
Dan Lindsey, Faculty
Mary Lou Lockerby, Faculty
Elaine Logan, Classified Support Staff

Antonio Lollino, Adjunct Faculty
Philip MacDonald, Adjunct Faculty
David Malek, Dean, Natural Sciences
Jennifer Mangrum, Student
Stephen Mansfield, Associate Dean
Marcia Marton, Faculty
Bill Marzano, Vice President, Educational Services, Solar Communications
Rae Maslana, Classified Staff
Barbara Matthay, Program Coordinator
Bob McCray, Major Giver
Janet McCray, Major Giver
Lucy McGinn, Research Assistant
Rosemary McKinney, Program Coordinator
Karla Megow, Adjunct Faculty
Brian Melehan, Editor, *Courier* (Student Newspaper)
Mark Meyer, Faculty
Hal McAninch, former President, College of Dupage
Bob McDougal, Former Football Coach
Mike McKinnon, Trustee
Erica Miller, Student
Ralph Miller, Associate Dean, Natural Sciences; Director of Physical Education
Mary Ann Millush, Major Gifts Campaign Manager
Joe Miragliotta, Classified Staff
Joan Morris, Classified Staff
Joe Morrissey, Trustee
Lisa Mueller, Student
E.J. Mugnaini, Student
Pete Mumford, Student
Michael Murphy, President
Mike Murphy, Alumnus
Eileen Murray, Alumna
Kevin Murray, Student
Glenn Myers, Student
Marianne Myrick, Classified Staff
Jesse Nash, Adjunct Faculty

Ann Nickrand, Classified Staff
Kay Nielsen, Associate Vice President, Student Affairs
Ron Nilsson, Director
Irene O'Conner, Faculty
Norma Okada, Alumna
Kevin O'Kelly, Vice President, Student Government Association
Janie Oldfield, Director
Daniel O'Loughlin, Adjunct Faculty
Deirde Ann O'Malley, Adjunct Faculty
Linda Osanka, Adjunct Faculty
Howard Owens, Director
Vince Panzone, Faculty
Jaonne Parke, Classified Staff
Rumana Patel, Student
Carol Payette, Trustee
Mark Pe, Student
Karen Pedigo, Former Administrative Assistant to the President
Vincent Pelletier, Interim Vice President, Student Affairs
Vincent Persico, State Representative
Nancy Pfahl, Director, Resource Development Office
Meri Phillips, Director, Student Activities
David Pierce, President, American Association of Community Colleges
Charlotte Pillar, Faculty
Jacqueline Plourde, Adjunct Faculty
Deborah Postelwait, Faculty
Brian Prusko, Student
Jennifer Prusko, Alumna
Pat Puccio, Faculty
Barbara Ramirez, Student
Linda Randa, Faculty
Marvin Rasch, Classified Staff
Janine Rasmussen, Budget Manager
Mario Reda, Faculty, Head Soccer Coach for Women's Athletics
Margaret Rehayem, Wellness Coordinator
Judy Reisdorf, Adjunct Faculty

Mark Restaino, Student (interviewed with parents)
Susan Rhee, Faculty
Tom Richardson, Program Coordinator
Carol Ripenburg, Faculty
Omar Riyal, Student
Carol Rodgers, Alumna
Rick Rodriguez, Student
Tom Roesing, Associate Dean, Technology
Ann Marie Rosen, Director
Treveon Ross, President, Black Student Union
Fred Rudolph, Retired Auditor
Barbara Rundell, Faculty
David Russell, Director of Food & Beverage, Marriott Hotel
Deb Ryel, Program Coordinator
Carolyn Ann Sajdecki, Adjunct Faculty
Shamli Sandiford, Faculty
Al Santini, Faculty
Ron Schiesz, Faculty
Harlan Schweer, Director, Research & Planning
George Seaman, Jr., Classified Support Staff
Bob Seaton, former Faculty
Laura Seger, Student
Lauren Sharp, Associate Dean
Dale Simpson, Adjunct Faculty
Helen Shullaw, Classified Staff
Paul Sirvatka, Faculty
Thom Skibbe, Student
Gene Sladek, Photographer/Cinematographer
Pat Slocum, Program Coordinator
Karen Snell, Alumna
Bob Sobie, Faculty
Katie Sommers, Classified Support Staff
Mary Sparks, Student
Patricia Spencer, Classified Staff
John Sprague-Williams, Program Coordinator

Dorothy Sprenger, Classified Support Staff
John Staeck, Faculty
Nancy Stanko, Program Coordinator
Mitch Star, Student
Ed Storke, Associate Dean
Marlene Stubler, Director, Public Information & Production Services
Dee Sullivan, Classified Staff
Erin K. Sullivan, Adjunct Faculty
Ellen Sutton, Associate Dean
Sharon Swiglo, Classified Staff
Bob Tarsitano, Part-time Faculty
Charlie Thurston, Vice President Governmental Affairs, NICOR
Tom Tipton, Faculty
Lisa Travis, Student
Bill Troller, News Bureau Coordinator
Karen Troller, Classified Support Staff
Jack Turner, Major Giver
Edwin Tweedie, Adjunct Faculty
Tom Usry, Chief, Campus Security
Gale Vance, Adjunct Faculty
Diane E. Vandenbrouke, Adjunct Faculty
Aurelia Villaneuva, President, Latino Ethnic Awareness Organization
Margery Vincelette, Student
Richard Voss, Faculty
Eugene Wagner, Dean Occupational & Vocational Ed.
Della Walker, Classified Support Staff
Mike Ward, Program Coordinator
Nancy Webb, Faculty
Don Weber, Superintendent of Schools, District 203, Naperville
Gary Webster, Manager, Village of Glen Ellyn
Gary Wenger, Vice President, Information Technology
Kathy Wessel, Trustee
Ruth Whisler, Alumna
Vivian Wieglos, Classified Staff
Peggy Witt, Adjunct Faculty

Bonnie Wood, EWCCA-East West, Corporate Corridor Association
Helen Zaleski, Faculty
Keith Zeitz, Classified Staff
Sharon Zeman, Alumna
LuAnn Zimmick, Faculty
Mary Ann Zlotow, Program Coordinator
Doris Zughoul, Faculty
Jeanette C. Zweifel, Adjunct Faculty
Twenty-three Anonymous Students and Local Residents

APPENDIX C

COLLEGE OF DUPAGE
REVIEW INTERVIEW FORM

Name _____ Title _____ Date _____

The Board has asked us to review the condition of the College of DuPage. Please respond in terms of your impression of the following. Your answers will be kept in confidence

1. GENERAL CONDITION OF THE COLLEGE (STRENGTHS, LIMITATIONS)

2. ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

3. TECHNOLOGY

4. FACULTY (QUALITY, MORALE, PRODUCTION, SALARY)

5. STUDENTS (CREDENTIALS, MORALE, AWARENESS, RACIAL, NATIONAL, FINANCIAL AID, ET AL)

6. ADMINISTRATION

7. SENIOR OFFICERS

8. BUDGET AND FINANCE

9. FUND-RAISING AND DEVELOPMENT

10. PUBLIC AND GOVERNMENT RELATIONS

11. ALUMNI AFFAIRS

12. CAMPUS GOVERNANCE

13. BOARD OF TRUSTEES

14. COMPARATIVE CONDITION OF THE COLLEGE, DOCUMENTATION IF ANY

15. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS

JLF 2000

APPENDIX D

Materials Used in the Review:

"Fisher Template" (Appendix E)

1994 Self-Study
1994 North Central Association Report
North Central Association Accreditation Update
Campus Climate Survey
An Assessment Report on Students' General Educational Development at College of DuPage
Developing the Educational Priorities and Assessment Supporting Institutional Plan
Information Technology Plan
Five-Year Financial Plan
Energy Usage and Costs for Years 95-99
1999 Customer Satisfaction Survey
Community Needs Assessment
A Survey of College of DuPage Graduates
The Community College Feedback Report
PQP/Program Review
Adult Fast Track Program
Non-Returning Student Profile
Partners in Education Council (PIEC)
Productivity Report
Average Salary Comparisons
Student and Institutional Portraits
Current and Alternate Organization Charts
Cabinet and Executive Committee Minutes
External Audits
Resource Development Office Activities
Board Biographies